(SRI B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA).

and all energies are being put in to bring about unification of laws as expeditiously as possible.

Sri C. K. RAJAIAH SETTY.—Will the question of adopting the old Mysore laws be considered ?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—No doubt this will be considered.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—May I know whether the Government will consider the question of constituting a committee of legal experts to examine the various laws instead of entrusting this work to the Departments ?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—Appointment of committee is not the only method, but whenever necessary, committees and commissions will be appointed.

Sri M. RAMAPPA.—There is a lot of difference between the Bombay Prohibition Act and the Mysore Prohibition Act.

Mr. SPEAKER.--That is a matter of detail.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—If detailed information is required, I will require notice.

Sri M. RAMAPPA.—Is it the intention of the Government to unify the Prohibition laws of Bombay and Mysore ?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—Uniformity wlll be brought about in regard to all laws because there cannot be different areas in the same State having different laws. The basic idea is to have uniformity through out the State in the matter of laws.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಹಳೆಯ ಮೈಸೂರು ಮತ್ತು ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಸೇರಿರತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಸಮನ್ವಯ ಮಾಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಇನ್ನೂ ಎಷ್ಟು ಕಾನೂನುಗಳು ಸಮನ್ವಯವಾಗಬೇಕು ?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—I find it a little difficult to comprehend my friend fully. As I have already stated, out of the laws we have so far examined and studied, the laws that require unification number 600.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question time is over.

QUESTION FOR ANSWER ON THE DAY

(but not taken up).

Tarring of Channarayapatna-Tiptur Road.

Q.—121. Sri N. G. NARASIMHE GOWDA (Sravanabelagola).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) the date on which the estimate was prepared in respect of the tarring of the Channarayapatna-Tiptur road and the reasons for not sanctioning the same so far ;

(*b*) whether they are aware of the existence of Government and private mines which cause heavier traffic on that road than on any other first grade road ;

(*c*) the reasons for not including this work in the Second Five-Year Plan ;

(*d*) whether they intend to accord sanction and to include that work in the Second Five-Year Plan ?

A.—Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH (Minister for Public Works).—

(*a*) No estimate for the work has been prepared.

(*b*) Part of the road is subject to seasonal heavy traffic on account of the existence of mines, but it cannot be said that the traffic is heavier than on other first grade roads.

(*c*) Low priority and limited funds.

(*d*) No.

BUDGET FOR 1957-58—DEMANDS FOR GRANTS

Procedure.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Before we proceed with the general discussion of the Demands and the Cut Motions, I would like to make a brief statement for the consideration of the House.

According to clause (2) of article 203 of the Constitution, so much of the estimates as relate to expenditure other than expenditure charged upon the

Consolidated Fund of the State has to be submitted in the form of Demands for Grants to the Assembly. This House will vote these Demands for the next 12 days in respect of the year 1957-58. As this is the first time that this new Assembly of the enlarged State of Mysore will be taking up this part of the financial business, I think it is desirable that we decide upon the procedure to be followed in regard to this matter. No doubt, our Rules of Procedure set out to some extent the procedure to be followed, but these rules are not comprehensive and the procedure is one that has to be built up by conventions. The procedure in respect of financial business embodied in the Constitution largely follows the procedure of the House of Commons in England. This procedure has undergone considerable modifications over the long period of the history of the British Parliament. As the procedure exists today in England, it is governed by two important principles. One is that the Government is responsible for every detail of every vote and that therefore a motion for reduction of a Demand for grant by even a nominal amount is regarded as a major defeat to the Government in power. The second principle is that, due to the vast expansion of governmental activities and the vast sums of moneys which have to be voted every year, it would be impossible for the House as a whole to examine these several items of expenditure in detail and that therefore the House should concentrate not on the financial aspect of each Demand but only on the policy of the Government and the activities of the Ministers and officials whose salaries are provided in them. The system has therefore, become established by which all the Demands for grants are voted within a specified time so that it really becomes immaterial to the Government as to how many days a Demand is discussed or how the Demands are taken up. In return, the Opposition is given the right to select the Demands to be put down for discussion on any particular day allotted for this kind of business. Though the standing orders of the House of Commons provide for cut motions, they are only moved on important matters of policy and these policy matters are put down for discussion on a particular day or days at the choice of the Opposition. Similarly, a cut motion, as I have explained above, being in the nature of a motion involving the question of confidence in the party in power, ought not to be moved by a member of the party in power. However, these several principles have grown with the emergence of clear-cut political parties in England. In India, or to speak more particularly, in Mysore while there is a large majority party, the Opposition is not substantial or definite but consists of one party ond other groups or independent members. It is, however, desirable that, at least to the extent possible, we should develop healthy conventions for our guidance so that the debate during the 12 days allotted for voting of Demands may have some reality and substance.

Under our rules, no doubt every member irrespective of the party to which he belongs has a right to table a cut motion and so long as the cut motion satisfies the rules, the Speaker has no option but to admit it. The order in which these cut motions should be taken up is specified in the rules and by circulars and they have to be taken up, in the order provided in them. I would, however, like to make a suggestion for the consideration of the Hon'ble Members. Most cut motions relate, as far as I have been able to gather, to matters of minor detail and are really in the nature of local grievances for which the member seeks redress. In discussing these matters, one is prone to lose sight of the larger policies involved in a Demand. The purpose of debate in this House of all these Demands is to focus the light of public opinion and healthy constructive criticism on the policies of the Government, and either to support the policy or explain why the policy requires change depending on whether one belongs to the Party in power or the Opposition. I, therefore, suggest that the time allotted for the Demands would be best utilised by a debate on the broad policies underlying each Demand instead of confining ourselves

(MR. SPEAKER.)

to the several cut motions. Further, we have 54 Demands for twelve days and if we proceed to take up the several cut motions coming up from day to day, we can hardly take up 10 per cent, of the cut motions tabled and even for those 10 per cent of cut motions, we can hardly devote more then one or two minutes for each cut motion. Members will at once realise how illusory and fanciful such a debate becomes. The purpose of a cut motion being to draw the attention of Government to a particular grievance, I would request the Government to examine each cut motion in detail administratively and take necessary action but that cut motions themselves need not be taken up on the floor of the House. If this is agreed to, the members would be free to discuss the policies underlying the Demands. Secondly, as it would be obviously impossible for all the Demands to be covered within the twelve days even if we agree not to take up cut motions, I suggest that the House should limit itself in any particular financial year to the debate on a few Demands. The life of the House being five years, it should thus be possible to cover all the Demands over these five years. This would enable the House to concentrate its attention in some detail on the policy underlying the departments over the five years, but take up only a few Demands each year.

I have spoken at some lenghth because I feel this is a matter which is vital from the point of view of useful and fruitful debate and I am anxious that all Hon'ble Members should give some consideration to these aspects. Ultimately, I am prepared to abide by the view of the House and I do hope there will be unanimity in whatever decision is taken about the procedure to be followed in this House in regard to the Demands for grants.

*Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA (Chief Minister).—Sir, I listened to your statement with due regard and I agree with what you have said. I accept your suggestion that cut motions need not be moved individually. On behalf of this part of the House I submit that none of us is going to move any cut motions and I am sure that Members opposite also will accept the suggestion made by you so that by this procedure we may cut short unnecessary attention on and spotlighting of minor individual cases. On behalf of Government I would like to state that these cut motions which refer to various subjects would be administratively considered by Government. So I hope that the debate here would be confined to broad policies, as suggested by you.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ (ಹಿರಿಯೂರು).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿದ ಮೂರು ಅಂಶಗಳ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಸದ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ನಾವು ಪ್ರತಿ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡಿನ ಮೇಲೆಯೂ ನಮ್ಮ ನಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಹೊತ್ತಿನ ಅನಂತರ ವಿರಾಮ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡು ಬಾಕಿ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ತಮಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈಗ ಪ್ರತಿ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡನ್ನೂ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ, ಅವುಗಳ ಮೇಲಿನ ಕಟ್ ಮೋಷನ್ಸ್ ಸಹ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕಂಚಪ್ಪ.—ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ನಂಬರ್ 15-27 Administration of Justice ಮೊದಲು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು . . .

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಮೂರು ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡುಗಳನ್ನೂ ಒಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ.—ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡನ್ನೂ ಬೇರೆಬೇರೆಯಾಗಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will propose all these three Demands tot he House and then the debate can go on all the demands together. Hon'ble Members may make remarks on any or all the Demands in the course of the debate. As these Demands are inter-connected such a procedure will be very helpful and the debate will be comprehensive and intelligent.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ (ಚನ್ನಪಟ್ಟಣ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈಗ ಸಭಾನಾಯಕರು ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ನಾವು ಈ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡ್‌ಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯವನ್ನು ಹಾಕುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಹಿಂದೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ವಿಷಯ ಮೊದಲೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಇದ್ದುದರಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಸಲಹೆ ಸೂಕ್ತವಾಗಿ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. Lunch Hour ಆದಮೇಲೆ ನಾವೂ ನಮ್ಮ ನಾಯಕರೂ ಕುಳಿತು ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಕಟ್‌ಮೋಷನ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ನಾವು ಕಳುಹಿಸಬೇಕೇ ವಿನಾ, ಆಕಡೆಯವರು ಕಳುಹಿಸಬೇಕಾದ ಪ್ರಮೇಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಕಟ್‌ಮೋಷನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ, ಅವುಗಳಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರೆ no confidence ಸೂಚಿಸಿದಂತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅದರಿಂದ ಲಾಭವಿಲ್ಲ. ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡುಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ

ಕೂಡ, ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಏನೇನು ಡಿಮಾಂಡ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತಾರೆಯೋ ಅವುಗಳಿಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟೇ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ; ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅವರು ಆ ಕಡೆಯಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ಕಡೆಗೆ ಬಂದು ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆಕೊಡಿಸಿದ ಹಾಗೆ, ಹನ್ನೆರಡು ದಿನಗಳಲ್ಲಿ 54 ಡಿಮಾಂಡ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡಿ ಮುಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದೊಂದು ಡಿಮಾಂಡಿನ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಎರಡೆರಡು ದಿವಸ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಡಿಮಾಂಡುಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ನಮಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ದಿವಸ ಕೊಡಿ ಎಂದರೆ, financial year ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಸಾಧುವಾದ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ನಾವು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರತಿ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇತರ ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ, ನಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಕದ ನೆರೆಯ ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಮಾರು ಎರಡೆರಡು ಅಧಿವೇಶನಗಳಾಗಿವೆ. ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಇವರು ಅಧಿವೇಶನವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಮಾಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಬಹಳ ನಿಧಾನ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಮಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೂಡ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಡಿಮಾಂಡುಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಆ ಕಡೆಯವರು ಮಾತನಾಡಬಾರದು. ಡಿಮಾಂಡುಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ, ಪ್ರತಿಪಕ್ಷದವರಾದ ನಮಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಡಿಮಾಂಡುಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿದ್ದರೆ ಸೂಕ್ತವಾಗಿ ಮತ್ತು ನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿ ಇರುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN (Kolar Gold Fields).—Sir, it is true that there are cut motions of a variety of nature. Many a time it is very difficult, especially for some of us, to decide where exactly a matter of policy is involved and where exactly a matter of detail is involved. I feel that at times they inter-penetrate. It may be a minor matter of detail and yet it may involve a matter of policy also from our point of view. For instance, there is a cut motion which calls for deterrent punishment for prohibition offences. The nature of punishment is looked upon as a matter of detail, but I would like to look upon it as a matter of general policy.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have already stated that in spite of the fact that you do not move the cut motions, the debate will not be stifled. Hon'ble Members would be in a position to offer remarks, though they would not be moving the cut motions. The debate will be full-dressed.

ಶ್ರೀ ಯು. ಎಂ. ಮಾದಪ್ಪ (ಚಾಮರಾಜನಗರ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ವಿರೋಧಿ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾವು ಕಳೆದ ಐದು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಆಡಳಿತ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಖೋತಾ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸುವ ಆವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸತತವಾಗಿ ಹೋರಾಡಿದೆವು. ತಾವು ಇಂದು ನಾವು ಒತ್ತಾಯಪಡಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದ ಸತ್ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯವನ್ನು ಆಚರಣೆಗೆ ತಂದುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ವಿರೋಧಿ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಪರವಾಗಿ ನಿಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಅಭಿನಂದಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ವಿರೋಧಿ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಈ ಒಂದು ಸತ್ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯವನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆಚರಣೆಗೆ ತರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೆ ದುಡಿದುದರ ಫಲವಾಗಿ ಅದು ಇಂದು ಈಡೇರಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಈ ದಿವಸ ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಸುದಿನ; ಮರೆಯತಕ್ಕಂಥ ದಿವಸವು ಅಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಬಲ್ಲೆ. ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಟ್ರೆಜರಿ ಬೆಂಚಿನವರಿಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸುವದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಇದೆ. ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದವರಾದ ನಾವು ಖೋತಾಪ್ರಸ್ತಾವಗಳನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸಲು ನಮಗೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷವು ಎಂದರೆ ಪ್ರಜಾ ಸೋಷಲಿಸ್ಟ ಪಾರ್ಟಿ ಮಾತ್ರವಲ್ಲ; ಇಂಡಿಪೆಂಡೆಂಟ್ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿರುವುದಾಗಿ ತಾವು ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಕೂಡಲೇ ನಾವೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಎಲ್ಲ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರೊಡನೆ ನಾವು ಲಂಚ್ ಟೈಂ ಆದಮೇಲೆ ಒಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿ ವಿಚಾರ ವಿನಿಮಯ ಮಾಡಿ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಖೋತಾಪ್ರಸ್ತಾವಗಳನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುತ್ತೇವೆ. ತಾವು ಈಗ ತಿಳಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಸತ್ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯವನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆ ಮತ್ತು ಖೋತಾಪ್ರಸ್ತಾವಗಳ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ order of preference ನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಯಪಡಿಸುವದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟಪಡುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಈಗ ಮೂರು ಡಿಮಾಂಡುಗಳನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಡಿಮಾಂಡಿನ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡಲು ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ಕ್ಲುಪ್ತ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will put all the motions to the House and the debate will be upon on all the three Demands in the list.

Sri U. M. MADAPPA.—Can we select the cut motions ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the Hon'ble Member wants to move the cut motions then, of course, he can do so. But if it is a question of selecting the cut motions, that puts me in an awkward position.

Sri U. M. MADAPPA.—Of course, Sir, I realize that we can take part in the debate even without moving the cut motions.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The debate will be full-dressed and will not be curtailed simply because the cut motions have not been moved. The Hon'ble Members can make their remarks on the substance of the cut motions.

Sri U. M. MADAPPA.—As usual ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes.

DEMAND No. 15—ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.

27. Administration of Justice.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The demand is made :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 69,39,100 be granted to Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1958, in respect of 'Administration of Justice'."

DEMAND No. 16—JAILS AND CONVICT SETTLEMENTS.

28—Jails and Convict Settlements.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The demand is made :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 37,35,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1958, in respect of 'Jails and Convict Settlements'."

DEMAND No. 17—POLICE.

29. Police.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The demand is made :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,26,64,600 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1958, in respect of 'Police'."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Members can make their remarks on all of them, any of them or any two of them.

Sri J. H. SHAMSUDDIN (Honavar).—Sir, as the Hon'ble Ministers have made the Demands, they would have to move them.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member is thinking of the procedure obtaining in Bombay. I was also thinking on those lines. But the procedure differs from place to place. Here, the Demand is put on behalf of the Treasury Benches by the Chair itself.

Sri V. S. PATIL (Belgaum).—On a point of order, Sir. You just said that Demand had been made by virtue of the fact that you read the Demand to the House. I submit, Sir, that the Demand cannot be made to this House either by the Chair or the Secretaries, but the Ministers concerned should make them. Unless the Government make the Demand, no discussion can be proceeded with.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have already explained that there are two kinds of procedure in this respect. One is that Hon'ble Minister will make the Demand and the other is that the Demand is put to the House by the Chair. I have followed the second procedure. If it is the intention of the Hon'ble Member that the Minister himself should make the Demand and that I should propose it to the House, I have no objection to follow such a procedure. But that is not necessary. Such a procedure is not observed in all the Legislative Assemblies. Perhaps members from the Bombay-Mysore area are thinking of the procedure there.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—The Demand is made by the Government and not by the Chair, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Budget has been presented to the House and therefore the Demands have already been made by the Government.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ (ಚನ್ನಪಟ್ಟಣ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, 1957-58 ನೆಯ ಸಾಲಿನ ಆಯವ್ಯಯದ ಅಂದಾಜು ಪಟ್ಟಿಯ ಪೈಕಿ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡು ನಂಬರು 15, 16 ಮತ್ತು 17 ಇವುಗಳನ್ನು ಹಣ ಪಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದವರು ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಮೂರು ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡುಗಳ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಈ ಮೂರು ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡುಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಇಲಾಖೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ನ್ಯೂನಾತಿರಿಕ್ತಗಳೇನು, ಎಷ್ಟು ಹಣ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಮತ್ತು ಎಷ್ಟು ಹಣ ಮಂಜೂರುಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ವಿಶದವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಮೊಟ್ಟಮೊದಲನೆಯದು ಆದ ಡಿಮಾಂಡು ನಂಬರು 15, Administration of justice ಬಗ್ಗೆ 69, 39, 100 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿ

ದ್ವಾರೆ. ಈ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡಿನ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡುವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಂಗ ಮತ್ತು ಕಾರ್ಯಾಂಗ ಇವುಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕವಾಗಿ ಇರುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಕಾರ್ಯಾಂಗ ಮತ್ತು ನ್ಯಾಯಾಂಗ ಯಾವುದೂ ಒಂದಕ್ಕೊಂದು ಒಳಪಟ್ಟಿರಬಾರದು. ಮತ್ತು ಒಂದರಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಕೈಹಾಕಬಾರದು. ಎಂಬ ಘನ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾಗ್ಗೂ ಹಿಂದಿನ ಸರಕಾರವು ಮಲ್ಲಪ್ಪ ಕಮಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ನಿಯಮಿಸಿ ಒಂದು ರಿಪೋರ್ಟು ತರಿಸಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಆ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ನ್ಯಾಯಾಂಗ ಮತ್ತು ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗ ಬೇರ್ಪಡಿಸುವ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಲ್ಲಪ್ಪ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಒಪ್ಪಿಸಿದ ವರದಿಯ ಶಿಫಾರಸುಗಳ ಮೇರೆಗೆ ಏನನ್ನೂ ಸಾಗಿಸಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಳೆಯ ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಾಗಲಿ ಹೊಸ ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಾಗಲಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಂಗ ಮತ್ತು ನ್ಯಾಯಾಂಗ ಇಂಗ್ಲೆಂಡಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಬೇರ್ಪಡಿಸುವುದಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಕಾರ್ಯಾಂಗ ಮತ್ತು ನ್ಯಾಯಾಂಗ ಒಂದೇ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಹಳೆಯ ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಆರು ಜನ ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟಿನ ಜಡ್ಜಿಗಳು ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾಯಿತು. ಹಿಂದಿನ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲ ಕೂಡ ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಆರು ಜಸ್ಟೀಸುಗಳು ಇರಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಈ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನು ಪೂರ್ಣಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲ.

ಈ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಮಂಡಲ ಕೂಡ ಪೂರ್ತಿಯಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಂಗ ಮತ್ತು ನ್ಯಾಯಾಂಗದ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಅನುಕೂಲ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಹಿಂದು ಮುಂದು ಎಳೆಯುತ್ತದೆಂಬುದು ಜಡ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಅನುಸರಿಸುತ್ತಿರುವ ನೀತಿಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿರಬೇಕಾದ ಆರು ಜನ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಧೀಶರ ಪೈಕಿ ಮೂರೇ ಜನರು ಬಹಳದಿವಸ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಕೊನೆಗೆ ಇಬ್ಬರೇ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಬಂತು. ಹಳೆಯ ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ, ಆಗಲೇ ಎಲ್ಲರ ನೇಮಕವೂ ಪೂರ್ತಿಯಾಗಿ ಆಗಿದ್ದಿದ್ದರೆ ಈದಿವಸ ಹೊರಗಡೆಯಿಂದ ಮುಖ್ಯ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಧೀಶರ ನೇಮಕವಾಗಿ ಬರುವ ಪ್ರಮೇಯವೇ ಬರುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲವೆನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ದಿವಸ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಲು ಕಾರ್ಯಾಂಗ ಹಿಂಜರಿದಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಹೀಗಾಯಿತು. ಆಗ ಹೈ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನ ಸಲಹೆಯನ್ನು ತಿರಸ್ಕಾರಮಾಡಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಂಗ ಸ್ವತಃ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡಿದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಹೊರಗಿನಿಂದ ಜಸ್ಟಿಸ್ ದಾನಗುಪ್ತರು ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಬರಬೇಕಾಯಿತು. ಇವರ ನೇಮಕವನ್ನು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಓದಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಕಾರ್ಯಾಂಗ ತನ್ನ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯವನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಿದ್ದರೆ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಹೀಗೆ ಹೊರಗಿನಿಂದ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಧೀಶರು ಬರುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಂಗ ಹಿಂದಿನಿಂದಲೂ ಏನೊಂದು ಕೀರ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಗಳಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಸಿದ್ಧಿಯಾಗಿತ್ತೋ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಈಗ insult ಮಾಡಿದ ಹಾಗಾಗಿದೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದ 'ಬಾರ್' ಗೆ ಅಪಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿದ ಹಾಗಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಂಗದ ತಪ್ಪು ಹೆಜ್ಜೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಿತೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಈ ದಿವಸ ಇವರಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಹೊಸ ಮೈಸೂರಾಗಿದೆ. ಅನೇಕ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಹೈ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹತ್ತು ಜನ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಧೀಶರಿರಬೇಕು. . . . . .

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ನಿಜಲಿಂಗಪ್ಪ (ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಯವರು).—ಅದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯದ ಮಾತು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಹತ್ತು ಜನರಿರಲೇಬೇಕೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—Time Limit ಹಾಕಬೇಕೆಂದು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ತಾವು ಹದಿನೈದು ನಿಮಿಷ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ನಾನು ಮೊದಲು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ; ಈಗಿನಿಂದ ಹದಿನೈದು ನಿಮಿಷ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನನ್ನ ಕಿವಿಗೆ ಕೇಳಿಸಿದ ಹಾಗೆ Time limit ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ನನಗೆ ಹಾಗೆ ಕೇಳಿಸಿತೋ ಏನೋ, ಮೊದಲಿನಿಂದಲೂ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಲಮಿತಿಮಾಡುವ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯವಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ . . . . . .

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಆ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯವಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ—.ಇದ್ದರೂ ಮೊಟ್ಟ ಮೊದಲು ಮಾತನಾಡುವವರಿಗೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ನಿಧಾನವಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ. ಈಗ 3-35 ಗಂಟೆಯಾಗಿದೆ 3-50 ಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಗಿಸಿಬಿಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ಹಿಂದಿನದು ವಜಾ ಆಯಿತೆ ? (ನಗು) !

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ. – ಜನತೆಯ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೆ ವಂದನೆಯನ್ನರ್ಪಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಾನು ದೇಶಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಇನ್ನು ಹದಿನೈದು ನಿಮಿಷಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಆರು ಜನ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಧೀಶರ ನೇಮಕವಾಗಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈಗ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಜನರಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಚೀಫ್ ಜಸ್ಟೀಸ್ ರವರೂ ಸೇರಿ ಐದು ಜನರಾಯಿತು. ಇನ್ನು ಐದು ಜನರ ನೇಮಕವಾಗಬೇಕು. ನಿಧಾನ ಮಾಡದೆ ಬೇಗ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ದೇಶದ ಜನರಿಂದ ಸುಂಕಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿರುವಾಗ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬೇಗ ನ್ಯಾಯ ದೊರೆಯುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಒಟ್ಟು ಹತ್ತು ಜನರನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಬೆಂಚಿಗೆ ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಬೆಂಚಿನಿಂದ ಇಬ್ಬರನ್ನಾದರೂ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬೆಂಚಿಗೆ ಪ್ರಾತಿನಿಧ್ಯ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಈಗ ಹೊಸ ಚೀಫ್ ಜಸ್ಟಿಸ್ ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಬೆಂಚಿನಿಂದ ಶಿಫಾರಸ್ಸು ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸುಲಭ. ಆದರೆ 'ಬಾರ್'' ನಿಂದ ನೇಮಕಮಾಡುವುದು ಕಷ್ಟ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಇತರರ ಸಲಹೆ ಕೇಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೈದರಬಾದ್ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕ, ಉತ್ತರ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕ ಮತ್ತು ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ 'ಬಾರ್' ಇವೆಲ್ಲ ಇವೆ. ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕ, ದಕ್ಷಿಣ ಕನ್ನಡ, ಹಳೆಯ ಮೈಸೂರು—ಈ ಮೂರು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗಳ 'ಬಾರ್' ನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊನೆಯಪಕ್ಷ ಇಪ್ಪತ್ತು ವರ್ಷಕಾಲ ಹೈ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ 'ಪ್ರಾಕ್ಟೀಸ್' ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಮೂರು ಜನರನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಬೆಂಚಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವವರಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಸಿಕ್ಕದೇ ಹೋದರೆ ಅವರ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಜಿಗುಪ್ಸೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಎಷ್ಟು ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಏನು ಪ್ರಯೋಜನ ? ಎಂಬ ಭಾವನೆ ಅವರಲ್ಲುಂಟಾಗಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗಬಾರದು.

ಮುನ್‌ಸೀಫ್ ಕೋರ್ಟುಗಳು, ಮ್ಯಾಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಟ್ ಕೋರ್ಟುಗಳ ಹತ್ತಿರ 'ಲಿಟಿಗೆಂಟ್ಸ್ ' ಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗಿದೆ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕೂರಲು ಸರಿಯಾದ ಜಾಗವಿಲ್ಲ. ನ್ಯಾಯಾಧೀಶರಿಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಬಾತ್ ರೂಮ್ ಮುಂತಾದುವಿಲ್ಲ. ಸರಿಯಾದ ಕಟ್ಟಡಗಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಿಂದೆ ಕೂಲಿಮಠಗಳನ್ನು ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಅಂಥ ಕಟ್ಟಡಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೋರ್ಟುಗಳು ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿವೆ. ಲಿಟಿಗೆಂಟ್ಸ್‌ಗೆ rest houses ಕಟ್ಟಿಸಿ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ).

ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಅವರಿಂದ ಹಣ ವಸೂಲುಮಾಡಿ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಸ್ಥಾನಗಳನ್ನೇರ್ಪಾಡುಮಾಡಿರುವಾಗ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಅನುಕೂಲಗಳನ್ನೊದಗಿಸಬೇಕಾದುದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ. ನನಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲದೇ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಮಿಕ್ಕವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಕುರಿತು ನನ್ನ ಮಿತ್ರರು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ನಾನು ಬೇರೆ ಒಂದೆರಡು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಜೈಲುಗಳ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದೆರಡು ಮಾತು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಖೈದಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಕ್ಕಾಲು ಪಾಲು ಜನ ಪೋಲೀಸರು ಅವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಕೇಸ್‌ಹಾಕಿ, ಶಿಕ್ಷೆಯಾಗಿ ಜೈಲಿಗೆ ಬಂದಿರುವರು. ಇಂಥವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಯಾವ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿರಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಯಾವ ಪೋಲೀಸಿನವರು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಶಿಕ್ಷೆ ಕೊಡಿಸಿದರೋ ಆ ಪೋಲೀಸರನ್ನು ಖೈದಿಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ನಡೆಸಲು ನೇಮಕಮಾಡಿದರೆ, ಆ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಅವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಹಿಂದಿನ ದ್ವೇಷವಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದೇ ಮನೋಭಾವವಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಖೈದಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಅನನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ನ್ಯಾಯಾಂಗದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿದ್ದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ನ್ಯಾಯಾಂಗದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳೊಬ್ಬರನ್ನು ಜೈಲುಗಳ ಮುಖ್ಯಾಧಿಕಾರಿಯಾಗಿ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಹಿಂದೆ ಮೆಡಿಕಲ್ ಇಲಾಖೆಯವರನ್ನು ಈ ಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ವೈದ್ಯ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಮುಖ್ಯಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯನ್ನು ಈ ಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕಿರುವುದು ಇದೇ ಮೊದಲ ಸಾರಿ. ಜುಡಿಷಿಯಲ್ ಇಲಾಖೆಯಿಂದ ಒಬ್ಬ ಜಿಲ್ಲಾ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಧೀಶರನ್ನೋ ಹೈ ಕೋರ್ಟ್ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಧೀಶರನ್ನೋ ಹಾಕುವುದ ಸೂಕ್ತ. ಖೈದಿಗಳನ್ನು ನಿಕೃಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ನೋಡದೆ ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ಮಮತೆ ಇರುವವರು ಆ ಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿರಬೇಕೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಸಲಹೆ.

1946 ಅಥವಾ 1947 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಜೈಲುಗಳ ಸುಧಾರಣಾ ಸಮಿತಿ ನೇಮಕವಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಹಳೆಯ Autocratic ಸರ್ಕಾರವಿದ್ದಾಗ ಈಗಿನವರು ಜೈಲುಗಳಲ್ಲಿದ್ದು ಇವರಿಗೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದ ಹಿಂಸೆಯ ಅರಿವಾಗಿದೆ. ಆಗ ಇವರು ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೋ ಆ ಸುಧಾರಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡದೆ ಹಳೆಯ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನೇ ಈ ಹೊತ್ತಿನವರೆಗೂ ಇಟ್ಟು ಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಇವರಿಗೆ ದೇಶಪ್ರೇಮವೆಷ್ಟಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಾವೇ ಯೋಚಿಸಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ (ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಶಾಖೆಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು).—ನಾನೂ ಅನುಭವಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ನಾನೂ ಅನುಭವಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ನಾನೂ ಬಹಳ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಒಂದು ಸೇಂದಿ ಅಂಗಡಿಗೆ ಬೆಂಕಿ ಹಾಕಿದೆನೆಂದು ಪೋಲೀಸರು ನನ್ನನ್ನು ಹಿಡಿದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಿ ಲಾಕಪ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರು. ಆದರೆ ಕನ್ವಿಕ್ಷನ್ ಆಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಶಿವಪುರದ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಅನೇಕ ಪಟೇಲ್ ಶಾನುಭೋಗರಿಗೆ ರಾಜಿನಾಮೆ ಕೊಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಅವರಿಂದ ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆ ಕೊಡಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಆದರೆ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್‌ನವರಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವಾರ್ಥ ಬೆಳೆದದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಹೊರಗೆ ಬರಬೇಕಾಯಿತು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ರಿಕಾರ್ಡುಗಳು ಈಗಲೂ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಕಚೇರಿಯಲ್ಲಿವೆ. ಇದು ಹಾಗಿರಲಿ. ನನಗೆ ಇನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲದೇ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಮುಂದಿನ ವಿಚಾರ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಕಳೆದ ಜೈಲ್ ಸುಧಾರಣಾ ಸಮಿತಿ ಏನು ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಗಮನಿಸಿ, ಈಗ ಕಡ್ಡಾಯವಾಗಿ ಸುಧಾರಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಲು ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಸಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತ; ಮಾಡಲೇಬೇಕೆಂದು ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಖೈದಿಗಳ ಮನೋಭಾವ ಅವರು ಜೈಲಿನಿಂದ ಹೊರಗೆ ಬರುವಾಗ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯಾಗಿರಬೇಕು. ಸಮಾಜದ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಹೇಗೆ ನಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಅವರು ಅರಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಮನಸ್ಸು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡ ಬೇಕು. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಅವರು ಹೊರಗೆ ಬರುವಾಗ ಪಾಪರ್‌ಗಳಾಗಿ ಬರಬಾರದು. ಅವರು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಸಂಪಾದನೆ ಮಾಡಿ, ವಿದ್ಯೆ ಕಲಿತು, ಬುದ್ಧಿವಂತರಾಗಿ, ಸಮಾಜದಲ್ಲಿ ಗಣ್ಯವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಗಳಾಗಿ ಬಾಳಬೇಕು. ಜೈಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಖೈದಿಗಳ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಹೇಗೆ ನಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವರೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾನು ನೋಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಬಹಳ ಅಸಹ್ಯಕರವಾದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ವರ್ತಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಖೈದಿಗಳು ರಾತ್ರಿಹೊತ್ತು ಮೂತ್ರ ವಿಸರ್ಜನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಒಂದು ಮಡಿಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಯಾವುದೋ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಖೈದಿಗಳನ್ನು ಬೆಂಕಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಕಿ ಸುಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರಂತೆ. ಅದೇ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿದೆ, ಜೈಲುಗಳ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ.

ಇಷ್ಟು ತಿಳಿವಳಿಕೆಯುಳ್ಳವರು ಸುಧಾರಣೆಮಾಡಲು ಮನಸ್ಸು ಮಾಡದಿದ್ದರೆ ನಾವು ಏಕೆ ಹೇಳಬೇಕೊ, ಏನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೋ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ತಾವು ದೊಡ್ಡಮನಸ್ಸು ಮಾಡಿ ರಿವೈಸ್ ಮಾಡಲೇಬೇಕು ಎಂದುಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗಳು ಎಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಿವೆಯೋ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡಿ ಹಣ ಸಂಪಾದಿಸುವುದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ, ಜೈಲಿನಿಂದ ಹೊರಗಡೆ ಹೋದಾಗ ಅವರು ಸಂಪಾದನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಕೆಟ್ಟತನವನ್ನು ಮಾಡದೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯತನದಿಂದ ನಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ವಿಚಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಹತ್ತು ನಿಮಿಷಗಳು ಮಾತ್ರ ಉಳಿದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾಗಿದ್ದ ಶ್ರೀ ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪನವರು ಹೇಳಿದರು, ಗಾಂಧೀಜಿಯವರು ಸ್ವರ್ಗದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು. ಅವರು ಸ್ವರ್ಗಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋದದ್ದೇನೋ ನಿಜ, ಸ್ವರ್ಗದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಗಾಂಧೀಜಿಯವರು ಅಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅಥವಾ ನಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಎನ್ನುವ ವಿಷಯಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಸ್ವರ್ಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಗಾಂಧೀಜಿಯವರು ಶಾಂತಿಯಿಂದ ಇರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದದ್ದು ತಮ್ಮಗಳೆಲ್ಲರ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ ಹೌದೋ ಅಲ್ಲವೋ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅವರು ನರಕದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ನಾನು ವಿರೋಧ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಾವುಗಳೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಪಟ್ಟು ಅವರು ಹಾಕಿರತಕ್ಕ ಮಾರ್ಗದಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದು ಅವರ ತತ್ವಗಳಿಗನುಗುಣವಾಗಿ ನಡೆದು ಅವರು ಸ್ವರ್ಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಶಾಂತಿಯಿಂದ ಇರುವಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಪೋಲೀಸುರಾಜ್ಯ ಇರಬಾರದು, ಸುರಾಜ ಇರಬೇಕು ; ರಾಮರಾಜ್ಯವಾಗಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಗಾಂಧೀಜಿ ಮಹಾಪುರುಷರು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ನಾವುಗಳೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಯಾವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಹೋರಾಟ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೆವು ಎಂದು ನೋಡಬೇಕು. ಹಿಂದೆ ಬ್ರಿಟಿಷರ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ದಳ ಈಗ ಹತ್ತರಷ್ಟು ಆಗಿದೆ. 1904 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಏನು ಆಗಿತ್ತು ಈಗಲೂ ಅದೇ ಇದೆ. ಆಗಿನ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಮನೋಭಾವ ಇತ್ತು

ಎಂಬುದನ್ನೂ ನೋಡಬೇಕು. ಆಗಿನ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಜಬರದಸ್ತು ಹೇಗಿತ್ತು ಎಂದರೆ ಲಾಕಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಹಾಕಿಬಿಡಿ, ಜೈಲಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಬಿಡು, ಹೂತು ಹಾಕಿ ಎಂದು ಮುಂತಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿ ಭಯಭೀತಿ ಉಂಟುಮಾಡುವ ಕಾಲ ಹೀಗೆ 1904ನೆ ಇಸ್ವಿಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಹಿನ್ನಲೆ ಪೋಲೀಸ್‌ನೀತಿ ಆಯ ದಿವಸದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಚರಣೆಯ ಹಿನ್ನಲೆಯನ್ನೂ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಭಯಂಕರವಾಗಿತ್ತು ಎಂಬುದು ತಮಗೇ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇವತ್ತು ಆ ಹಿನ್ನಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಯಾರಾದಂಥ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನೂ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಪೋಲೀಸಿನವರ ಮನೋಭಾವವನ್ನೂ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಅವರು ಜನರೊಂದಿಗೆ ಅಣ್ಣತಮ್ಮಂದಿರು ಇದ್ದಹಾಗೆ ಇರಬೇಕು, ಅವರು ಇರುವುದು ನಮ್ಮನ್ನು ರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ, ಅವನ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಇವನ ಹತ್ತಿರ ದುಡ್ಡು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಮೋಸ ಮಾಡದೆ ತಪ್ಪು ಮಾಡಿದವರನ್ನು ಶಿಕ್ಷಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮತ್ತು ಜೈಲಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪೋಲೀಸು ಇರುವುದು ಎನ್ನುವ ಮನೋಭಾವನೆ ಬರಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಈ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಆಕ್ಟು ಕೂಡ ಆ ತರದಲ್ಲಿ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯಾಗಬೇಕು. ಅಂತಹ ಆಕ್ಟ್‌ತಂದು ಪಾಸುಮಾಡಲು ಏಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲಾ, ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ ಅವರು ಹಿಂದೆ ಹೋಂಮಿನಿಷ್ಟರಾಗಿದ್ದಾಗ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ.—ಡ್ರಾಫ್ಟು ಆಗುತ್ತಾ ಇದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಖರ್ಚು ಲೆಕ್ಕಹಾಕಿದರೆ 3ಕೋಟಿ ಚಿಲ್ಲರೆ ಇದೆ. 1946–47ರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ಅಯೋಗ್ಯಸರ್ಕಾರ ಅಸಹಾಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಎಂದು ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೋ ಅವರೇ ಹಳೆಯ ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ 29ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನೂ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಳಸಾರಿಗೆ ಇವತ್ತೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಇಲಾಖೆಗಾಗಿ 3 ಕೋಟಿ ಚಿಲ್ಲರೇ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದನ್ನೂ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಪೋಲೀಸು ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಹೀಗೆ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. 3 ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನೂ ಎಲ್ಲಿಂದ ತರುವುದು ? ಹೇಗೆ ತರುವುದು ? ಹೇಗೆ ಒದಗಿಸುವುದು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಎಷ್ಟುಜನ ನೊಂದಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನ ತಾವು ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಯಾವ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಈ ಇಲಾಖೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಬೇಕು ? 1946–47ರಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದ ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ಆಟೋಕ್ರಟಿಕ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಹೋಗಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಸುರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಬಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ಪೋಲೀಸು ಇಲಾಖೆಗೆ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡುವ ಅಂತರವನ್ನೂನೋಡಿ ಹಿಂದೆ ಇದ್ದ 29 ಲಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ ಈಗ 3 ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಏಕೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ? ಜನರಿಗೆ ಹೊಟ್ಟೆಗೆ ಅನ್ನ ಬಟ್ಟೆ ಕೊಡದೆ ಪೋಲೀಸಿನವರಿಂದ ರಾಜ್ಯಭಾರ ನಡೆಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇದ್ದಾರೋ ಏನೋ ನನಗಂತೂ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತಾ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಇಲಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹಳೆಯ ಕಾಲದ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯಗಳೇ ನಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬರುತ್ತವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಹಿಂದಿನ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಇದ್ದಾಗ ಬಹಿರಂಗ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಇಷ್ಟೊಂದು ಹಣ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಇಲಾಖೆಗೆ ಯಾತಕ್ಕೆ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು? ಪೋಲೀಸಿನವರು ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದರು, ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದರು, ಸ್ವರಾಜ್ಯ ಬರಲಿ ಅವರನ್ನು ಡಿಸ್‌ಮಿಸ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಇವರನ್ನು ನೇಣು ಹಾಕುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದವರು ಈಗ ಒಬ್ಬರನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಪಕ್ಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೂರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡರು ; ಇನ್ನೊಬ್ಬರನ್ನೂ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಪಕ್ಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೂರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡರು. ಮತ್ತೊಬ್ಬರನ್ನೂ ಜೇಬಿನಲ್ಲಿ ತೂರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡರು. ಒಬ್ಬರನ್ನೂ ಡಿಸ್‌ಮಿಸ್ ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ವೆಂಕಟಪ್ಪ (ವಿದ್ಯಾಶಾಖೆಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು).—ನೇಣುಹಾಕುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಯಾರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು?

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಇಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಬಹಿರಂಗ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಶಿವಪುರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ, ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ, ನೇಣು ಹಾಕುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಮುಂತಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸರ್ ಮಿರ್ಜಾ ಬರಲಿ, ಏನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. . . .

ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ವೆಂಕಟಪ್ಪ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ನಾವು ಮಾಡಿದ ಭಾಷಣವಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಕೋಟ್‌ಮಾಡುವುದು ಉತ್ತಮ. ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಹೀಗೆ ವೇಗ್ ಆಗಿ ಹೇಳಿಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಲೆಜಿಸ್ಲೇಟೀವ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಡಿಂಗ್ಸ್‌ನ್ನೂ ತಿರಿವಿ ಹಾಕಿದರೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದೂ ಸಿಕ್ಕುತ್ತದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಹಾಗೆ ಈ ಸದನದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದೂ ಸಿಕ್ಕುವುದು ಬೇಕಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು ಸಿಕ್ಕಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ನಾನು ಚಿಕ್ಕವನಾಗಿದ್ದಾಗ ಲೆಜಿಸ್ಲೇಟೀವ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ ಮೀಟಿಂಗಿಗೆ ಬಂದು ಭಾಷಣಗಳನ್ನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೆ. ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ ಅವರು ಮತ್ತು ಇತರರು ಹೀಗೆ ಅನೇಕ ಭಾಷಣಗಳನ್ನೂ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಅವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಡಿಂಗ್ಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಇವೆ.ಆಗ ಭಾವನೆಗಳು ಹಾಗಿದ್ದುವು. ಇಲ್ಲಾ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದು ಏನೋ ಈಗ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯಾಯಿತು. ಅದು ನಮ್ಮ ದುರಾದೃಷ್ಟ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಇಲಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ರಿಟ್ರೆಂಚ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಆಗಬೇಕು. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಗೃಹಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಸದಾರಮೆ ನಾಟಕದ ವಿಚಾರ ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಸದಾರಮೆ ನಾಟಕದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಭಾವನೆಗಳನ್ನೂ ಬದಲಾಯಿಸಬೇಕು. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ದುಡ್ಡು ಏಕೆ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುವುದನ್ನೂ ಬೇರೆ ಭಾವನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ದುಡ್ಡನ್ನು ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ನಾಟಕದ ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ರಾಜ್ಯಭಾರವನ್ನೂ ಸುಲಲಿತವಾಗಿ ನಡೆಸಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಪೋಲೀಸ್‌ಸ್ಟೇಟು ಮೊದಲು ಹೋಗಬೇಕು. ಅಷ್ಟೊತ್ತೇ ನಾವು ಸ್ವರ್ಗದಲ್ಲಿ ನಗುವ ಗಾಂಧೀಜಿಯನ್ನು ನೋಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಹಳೆಯ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿನ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ದೌರ್ಜನ್ಯವನ್ನೂ ಇವತ್ತು ನಮ್ಮ ಚನ್ನಪಟ್ಟಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೇಳಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಬಾರದಂಥ ಅನ್ಯಾಯ ಪರಂಪರೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. I am prepared to adduce evidence before the Home Minister. ನಮ್ಮ ಚೀಫ್ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಸಹಾಯಮಾಡದೆ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದರೆ, ನಮ್ಮ ಜನಗಳೆಲ್ಲಾ ಜೈಲಿಗೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಇಂಡಿಯಾದ ಪ್ರೈಮ್ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರ್ ಅವರಿಗೂ ಕೂಡ ಬರೆದಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಒಂದು ಜುಡಿಷಿಯಲ್ ಎನ್‌ಕ್ವೈರಿ ಮಾಡಿ,ರುಜುವಾತು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಯಾರಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಈ ಮಹಾಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗದೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅವನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ನಾವು ಅಪರಾಧ ಮಾಡಿದಂತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ)
ರಿಂದ ಒಂದು ಜುಡಿಷಿಯಲ್ ಎನ್‌ಕ್ವೈರಿಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಏನೇನು ಆಧಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಬೇಕೋ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಲು ಸಿದ್ಧವಾಗಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಮೊಟ್ಟ ಮೊದಲು ಪೋಲೀಸ್‌ಸ್ಟೇಟ್ ಹೋಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಂಕಣ ಕಟ್ಟಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಮುಂದಿನ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಖರ್ಚನ್ನು 27ಲಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗದೆ ಇದ್ದರೂ ಅದನ್ನು 50ಲಕ್ಷಮಾಡಿ ಉಳಿದ ದುಡ್ಡನ್ನು ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆ ಅಥವಾ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸ ಮುಂದುವರಿಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಏನೇನು ಆಗಬೇಕೋ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಲಿ. ನಾನು ಈ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡಿಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಕೊಡದೆ ಇದ್ದರೂ ಅದನ್ನು ಪಾಸುಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನನ್ನ ಆತ್ಮ ಮಾತ್ರ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಓಟು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಷ್ಟು ಹೇಳಿ ನನಗೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೆ ವಂದನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಅರ್ಪಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA (Palyam).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I will confine myself only to the Police. The attitude of the Police must be consistent with our democratic socialistic set up. We are living in an age of democracy in which we all have got to feel that we are secure and can live in an atmosphere of security. But if we could see the attitude of the Police since independence, I wonder whether we are moving towards that end of realising the aim of having a Social Welfare State. We are aware of the particular attitude they had during the British regime and that kind of oppressive and bureaucratic mentality has got to be changed. In a democratic State there must be an atmosphere in which the common man should feel secure and the Police should work to create such an atmosphere. Now what has happened is altogether a different thing. We hear that the Police are not duly discharging the duties that have been assigned to them, and instead of preventing any breach of peace, they themselves become parties to breach of peace and also for making blackmarketeers to thrive, paving the way for corruption, some of them themselves being corrupt and in this state of affairs how can we expect their attitude to be in consonance with the socialistic set up ?

I would quote instances showing that the Police are not discharging their duties consistent with the democratic ideal that we are having. Take, for example, prohibition. In many places the Police are entrusted with the duty of enforcing prohibition and instead of that, we are finding instances, wherein the Police have themselves indulged in encouraging illicit distillation and taking part in these things. As a matter of fact, since I am coming from a dry area which is adjacent to a wet area, I know of instances where, if the culprit pays something, he will be let off and even for the purpose of releasing a man on bail, money is being given and innocent people are being charged in courts and there are instances where the courts have given a finding that these people are innocent and that they do not know anything so far as the offences with which they are charged, are concerned. The real offenders will not be booked because there is an obligation on the part of the Police towards them. When such is the state of affairs, how can the Government expect that the Police will assist in the enforcement of prohibition effectively ? I was given to understand and it was said that two Policemen of my taluk got themselves intoxicated and entered a house and attempted to outrage the modesty of women and when the villagers gave the information to the Inspector, they were arrested. When such a state of affairs is existing, how can we say that we are moving in a society in which democracy should prevail ?

Again take, for instance, the buses that are plying in rural areas and see whether the Police are checking or seeing that the buses are coming in time and that they are not overcrowded. I know of instances in which the Police Constables are paid some tips by the operators or some persons concerned the result of which is that there is no proper timing kept up, there is no punctuality and there is overcrowding. All these things are going on. If the people want facilities, let the Government provide more number of permits so that more buses may ply. My submission is that unless there is a change in the attitude of the Police so as to be consistent with our socialistic set up, I do not think that granting a huge amount under

this head is justifiable under any circumstances. I may state that in Madras buses are plying effectively in respect of timings, punctuality and other things. This Government should examine all these things and issue strict instructions and see that these things are followed and the common man is protected against oppressive methods resorted to by the Police. There must be an end to this sort of exploitation. The Government must infuse in the minds of the Police a high sense of civic duty and discipline; they must be made to understand that they are also part and parcel of the State and that they have got the moral obligation at least towards the State which they are liable to discharge and unless that sort of outlook is adopted by the Police, I do not think that we can boast that we are going towards the achievement of a socialistic welfare State. There should be a mental change altogether on the part of the Police. I do not say that every police officer is doing these things but I may say that most of them are doing these things. I do admit that adequate salaries are not being paid to them; I sympathise with them and I take this opportunity to request the Government to take necessary action to provide adequate salaries to them to enable them to obtain the basic necessities of life. Apart from it, because Government has not done it, does it mean that the Police should act in such a way as not to be consistent with our democratic spirit? That is what I wanted to state.

I also suggest to the Government that the Police Manual may be revised in such a way as to enable the State to move towards this democratic socialistic spirit.

MR. SPEAKER.—The House will now rise for Lunch and meet again at 4-30 P.M.

The House adjourned for Lunch at Four of the Clock and reassembled at Thirty Minutes past four of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

SRI G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was saying that instances were not wanting in which the Police exceeded their jurisdiction and powers and interfered in matters which were purely of civil nature; and unless, as I have already submitted, a feeling of security is created in the mind of the public, I cannot say what might be the far-reaching consequences thereof. Thus it has become all the more imperative that the State Government should take suitable action to infuse in the mind of the police people that they have got a sacred duty to perform and they have a sacred duty to defend the community against the evil designs and against all breaches of moral standards and values and for the maintenance of law and order, and that they are therefore required to discharge their duty impartially, unbiassed and with a sense of selflessness and with utmost loyalty to the State and with a consciousness that they owe a duty to themselves and to their fellows; and that above all, they must satisfy their own conscience in the discharge of their responsibilities. To render unselfish and loyal service must be a policeman's motto; and to this end, I submit Sir, there must be this reorientation and reformation in the outlook of the Police. Unless that is done, there is no justification whatever to say that we are moving towards a socialistic welfare State.

Having said so Sir, I request I should be permitted to make a few remarks about the administration of justice. Sir, I am given to understand that Mysore was progressive in every aspect but I cannot see it now, so far as administration of justice is concerned. But I understand that there are very many cases—a number of cases pending in the courts, the High Court and Lower Courts also, with the result that it is engendering ill-feeling between the parties to a case and the litigant public are put to a lot of difficulties. It should be the duty of the Government to see that litigation is made cheap and its disposal

expeditious. I need hardly quote sir: '*Justice delayed is Justice denied*' and Government should remedy the present state of affairs. They should see that litigation as far as possible is minimised, justice is meted out expeditiously and the case disposed of without undue delay. So far as my area is concerned, Sir, before integration we had two courts; but after integration, they have been clubbed into one, with the result that work has accumulated. I therefore request that arrangements be made so as to dispose of cases quickly and to mete out justice expeditiously. I may be permitted to point out on this occasion Sir, that the granting of adjournments in courts is one of the normal causes for the accumulation of arrears; and I understand that there are instances in which the police summoned witnesses at the cost of the State Exchequer and adjournments were being granted in respect of Sessions cases. In Madras, I find that such a state of affairs does not exist. As a matter of fact, every criminal case will be over within three months and civil cases will be disposed of in two years time, unless it is a very complicated case. I, therefore, suggest Sir, that this New State of Mysore has to make strenuous efforts to see that cases are disposed of quickly and expeditiously and an atmosphere is created in which the litigant public feels secure.

In respect of other matters, namely, Jails, Sir, provision must be made for training the prisoners to lead a better life after coming out of jail. They must be taught civic duties and the jail atmosphere must be changed and reformed so as to wean the convicts from the evil influence and change their mental attitude. Towards that end, I suggest that Government should take steps to see that these jails are reformed. Every care must be taken to see that these people will not lapse into their evil habits. I therefore request that Government must take suitable steps immediately in the best interests of the common man.

Thank you Sir,

(*Sri B. N. Boranna Gowda rose*)

Sri V. S. PATIL (Belgaum. I).—I have a point of order to raise, Sir. Is it in keeping with the dignity of this House that when this Particular Demand is being discussed, that the relevant Minister responsible should be absent from the House? Does it not mean to discredit the House as well as the dignity of the House?

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is the usual practice that the Hon'ble Minister should be present. But it sometimes happens that the concerned Ministers cannot be present in the House. I am trying to enforce the presence of Ministers as far as possible. But it will be rather very difficult for me to make them come here. But so long as other Ministers and Deputy Ministers are present in the House, there need not be any worry on that point. But still, I do agree that as far as possible it is better for the concerned Minister to be present in the House when a discussion of this nature is going on.

(At this stage the Hon'ble Minister for Home and Industries entered the House and took his seat.)

Of course, the Hon'ble Minister has come back in time. Perhaps he must have been held up somewhere for a couple of minutes outside.

(*Sri B. N. Boranna Gowda rose*)

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA.—On a point of information, Sir. The other side promised to give us, the Opposition, more time. On that understanding we arrived at a decision......

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is no agreement that the other side will not speak. But then they will try to be as brief as possible and that a few will take part in the Debate. I hope I will be able to give more chances to the Opposition. I know that the Opposition members are more anxious to speak on the Demands. Perhaps I may be able to give them more time.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎನ್. ಬೋರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ (ಬೇಲೂರು).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಪೋಲೀಸು ಖಾತೆಯ ಆಯವ್ಯಯದ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತ ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ತರಲು ಇಚ್ಛಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಸಾಧಾರಣವಾಗಿ ಪೋಲೀಸು ಖಾತೆ ಇರುವುದು ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ನೆಮ್ಮದಿ

ಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಮತ್ತು ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಬರ ತಕ್ಕಂತಹ ತೊಂದರೆಗಳನ್ನು ನಿವಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದ ಕ್ಕಾಗಿ. ಹೀಗೆ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅವರ ಸಂಸಾ ರಗಳಿಗೆ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ತೊಂದರೆಗಳು ಇವೆಯೋ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ನಿವಾರಿಸತಕ್ಕ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಪೋಲಿಸು ಖಾತೆಯವರಿಂದ ಏನೂ ಸಹಾಯ ವಾಗುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಪೋಲೀಸು ಇಲಾಖೆ ಯವರು ಹೇಗೆ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳು ವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನನಗೆ ಬಹಳ ವ್ಯಸನವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿಯ ಶೋಚನೀಯವಾದ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಗೆ ಕಾರಣವನ್ನು ಹೇಳ ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಆಡಳಿತದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ದಕ್ಷತೆ ದಿನದಿನಕ್ಕೂ ಇಳಿದುಹೋಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಪೋಲೀಸಿನ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಗಿನ ಮತ್ತು ಮಂಗಳೂರಿನ ಪೋಲೀಸು ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳೊಡನೆ ಹೋಲಿ ಸಿನೋಡಿದರೆ ಒಂದಕ್ಕೊಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊಂದಾಣಿಕೆಯಿಲ್ಲ ವೆಂಬುದು ನಮಗೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಯುತ್ತದೆ. ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವ ದಕ್ಷತೆಗೂ ಮತ್ತು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುವ ದಕ್ಷತೆಗೂ ಸಾಧಾರಣವಾಗಿ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸಗಳು ನಮಗೆ ಕಂಡುಬರುತ್ತವೆ. ಇದು ಏಕಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಅನೇಕ ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದಲೂ ಈ ಖಾತೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೂ ಮತ್ತು ಜನಗಳಿಗೂ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಹೊಂದಾಣಿಕೆಯಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಇರುವುದು ಒಂದು ಕಾರಣವಾ ಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಯಾರು ದಕ್ಷತೆಯಿಂದ ಯಾರು ನಿಷ್ಪರಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡು ತ್ತಿದ್ದರೆಂಬ ಭಾವನೆಯುತ್ತೋ ಅಂತಹ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಅಧಿ ಕಾರಿಗಳು ಲಂಚರುಷುವತ್ತಿನ ಅಪಾದನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಒಳಗಾಗಿ ಅವರನ್ನು ನಿವೃತ್ತಿಗೊಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ದಕ್ಷತೆಯ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನೇನೂ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆಲ್ಲ ಗೊತ್ತೇಇದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಕಡೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಗಮನ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಇಲಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಸರ್ವಾಧಿ ಕಾರಿಗಳಂತೆ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇವರಿಗೆ ಯಾರ ಭಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ ಮತ್ತು ಇವರಿಗೆಲ್ಲ ದೊಡ್ಡ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಬೆಂಬಲವಿದೆಯೆಂದು ತೋರು ತ್ತದೆ. ಅನೇಕ ಕಡೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಶಿಕ್ಷೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೂಡ ವಿಧಿಸುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವರ ಸರ್ವಾಧಿಕಾರದ ಮನೋಭಾವ ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಆಗಿದೆ ಎಂದರೆ, ಇವರು ಮಾಡುವುದೇ ಕಾನೂನು ಮತ್ತು ಇವರನ್ನು ಯಾರೂ ಕೇಳುವವರೇ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಈ ಮರ್‌ಡರ್ ಕೇಸುಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಶೇಕಡಾ 99 ರಷ್ಟು ಈ ಇಲಾಖೆಯವರೇ ಕಾರಣರು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತಾವು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಹೊಸ ಮೈಸೂರಿನ ವಿಷಯವೇ ಇಲ್ಲ ಹಳೆಯ ಮೈಸೂ ರಿನ ವಿಷಯವೇ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎಚ್. ಬೋರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ.—ಹೊಸ ಮೈಸೂ ರಿನ ಪರಿಚಯ ನನಗೆ ಅಷ್ಟು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಹಳೆಯ ಮೈಸೂರಿನ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಹೀಗೆ ಈ ಕಳವಿನ ಕೇಸುಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಅದ ರಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕೂಡ ಈ ಪೋಲೀಸಿನವರ ಸಹಾಯದಿಂದಲೇ ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಹೀಗಾಗು ತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಪೋಲೀಸು ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ ಗಳು ನಮ್ಮ ಜನಗಳನ್ನು ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ಈಡುಮಾಡಿ ದ್ದಾರೆ ಮತ್ತು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ತೊಂದರೆಗಳಾಗು ತ್ತಿವೆ ಮತ್ತು ಹಿಂಸೆಯಾಗುತ್ತಿವೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಿ ದರೂ ಸಹ ಇವರಿಂದ ಸಹಾಯವೇನೂ ಆಗುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವರು ಇರುವುದು ಜನಗಳ ನೆಮ್ಮದಿಯನ್ನು ಕಾಪಾ ಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಮತ್ತು ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡು ವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಈ ಜನ ಅರಿತಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾವೇ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಸಾರಿ ಪೋಲೀಸು ಸ್ಟೇಷನ್ನಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ದೂರನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೂ ಏನೂ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಿಂದೆ ಸೆಂಟ್ರಲ್ ಪ್ರಾವಿನ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾಗಿದ್ದ ಶ್ರೀ ಜಗ್ಜೀವನರಾಂ ಎಂಬುವರು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಆಡಳಿತವನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಸರಿಪಡಿಸಲು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಪಟ್ಟರೂ ಏನೊಂದೂ ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ ವೆಂದು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

ನೂರಕ್ಕೆ ತೊಂಬತ್ತು ಮಂದಿ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಇರುವ ರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಅನೇಕ ಜನ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಸಬ್‌ಇನ್ಸ್‌ಪೆಕ್ಟರುಗಳು, ಇನ್ಸ್‌ಪೆಕ್ಟರುಗಳು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಯಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರ ಸೂಪರಿಂಟೆಂಡೆಂಟರಿಗೂ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಇನ್ಸ್‌ಪೆಕ್ಟರುಗಳು ಸಬ್‌ಇನ್ಸ್‌ಪೆಕ್ಟರುಗಳು, ದಫೇದಾರರುಗಳು ತಪ್ಪುಮಾ ಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂಬುದು ಗೊತ್ತಿದ್ದರೂ ಅವರು ಕಣ್ಣು ಮುಚ್ಚಿಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈ ಹೊತ್ತು ಮೈಸೂರು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿರುವ Dry Districtಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಪಾನನಿರೋಧ ಯಶಸ್ವಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. Prohibition failure ಆಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇದನ್ನು scrap ಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಇತರರು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರ ಣರು ಯಾರು? ಪೋಲೀಸಿನವರೇ ಹೊರತು ಬೇರೆ ಯವರಾರೂ ಅಲ್ಲ. ಇವೊತ್ತು ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಡಿಪಾರ್ಟ್ ಮೆಂಟಿನವರಲ್ಲೇ ಬಹುಶಃ ಶೇಕಡ 90 ಮಂದಿಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಜನರು ಕುಡುಕರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಎಲ್ಲಿಯೋ ಮೂರು ನಾಲ್ಕು ಜನ ಕುಡಿಯದಿರಬಹುದು. ಸಾಮಾ ನುಗಳನ್ನು ಸಾಗಿಸುವ ನೆಪದಲ್ಲಿ ಬ್ರಾಂದಿ, ವಿಸ್ಕಿ, ಷರಾಬ್ ಮುಂತಾದುವುಗಳನ್ನು ಸಾಗಿಸುವವರು ಪೋಲೀಸಿನವರು. ಯಾರದೋ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಮನುಷ್ಯರ ಕಾರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪೋಲೀಸ್‌ನವರು ಸಾಗಿಸುತ್ತಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತಿರುವವರೂ ಪೋಲೀಸಿನವರು. ಮಾರಾಟ ಮಾಡಿಸುವವರೂ ಪೋಲೀಸಿನವರು. ಹೀಗೆ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಪೋಲೀಸಿನವರು connive ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಸಬ್‌ಇನ್ಸ್‌ಪೆಕ್ಟರು, ಇನ್ಸ್‌ಪೆಕ್ಟರು, ಸೂಪರಿಂಟೆಂಡೆಂಟರು ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಷರೀಕಾ ಗಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಪೋಲೀಸಿನವರನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ಅವ ರೇನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ? ತಮ್ಮ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿ ಯಿಲ್ಲ, ಹಠಾತ್ತನೆ ಹೋಗಿ raid ಮಾಡೋಣ ವೆಂದರೆ ಒಂದು ಜೀಪಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅವ ರಿಗೆ ಯಾವುದು ಕೊಟ್ಟರೂ ಇಷ್ಟೇ. ಈಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿಯೇ ಹೆಚ್ಚು. ಅದರಲ್ಲೂ ಅವರು ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಕೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ಕೊಟ್ಟರೂ, ಒಂದೆರಡು ಜನರಿಗೆ ಕೆಲಸ ಸಿಕ್ಕುವಂತೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ಆ ಇಲಾ ಖೆಯ efficiencyಯನ್ನು tone up ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇ ವೆಂಬುದು ಆಗದ ಮಾತು. ನಿಜವಾಗಿ tone up ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಆಶೆ ಸರಕಾರಕ್ಕಿದ್ದರೆ ನಾವಿಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಡ ತಕ್ಕ ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಅವರು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರಬೇಕು. ಅವರು ಮೊದಲು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯೆಂದರೆ ಕಾನ್‌ಸ್ಟೇಬಲ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು. ಈಗ ಈ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಸೂಪರಿಂಟೆಂಡೆಂಟರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿ ದ್ದಾರೆ, ಕೊಡಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಹುದ್ದೆಗೂ ಎಸ್.ಎಸ್.ಎಲ್.ಸಿ. ಮಾಡಿರುವಂಥವರು ಸಿಕ್ಕ ವಾಗ, ಲೋವರ್ ಸೆಕೆಂಡರಿ ಕೂಡ ಮಾಡದವರನ್ನು, ಶಿಫಾರಸ್ಸುಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ತಪ್ಪು. ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಕಾನ್‌ಸ್ಟೇಬಲ್ ಎಂದು ಯಾರನ್ನೂ ಕರೆಯ ಬಾರದು. ಪೋಲೀಸ್‌ಮನ್ ಎಂದು ಕರೆಯಬೇಕು. ಅವನಿಗೆ ಮೋಟಾರು ಬೈಸ್ಕಲ್ ಬಿಡುವುದು ಬಂದಿರ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ವಿ. ಬೋರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ).

ಬೇಕು ; ಕ್ರಿಮಿನಲ್ ಹೈಯರ್ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯನ್ನು ಪಾಸು ಮಾಡಿರಬೇಕು. ಅಂಥವನನ್ನು ನೇಮಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಅವನಿಗೆ ತನ್ನ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಶ್ಯಕವಾದ ಸಂಚಾರ ಸೌಕರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು, ಮೋಟಾರ್‌ಬೈಸ್ಕಲ್ ಮುಂತಾದುವುಗಳನ್ನು, ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಅದಿಲ್ಲದೆ, ಈಗಿನಂತಿದ್ದರೆ, ಅವನನ್ನು ದಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರೂ ಮಾತನಾಡಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಅವನ ಗೌರವ ಪ್ರತಿಷ್ಠೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸದೆ ಹೋದರೆ ಅವನು ಯಾವ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನೂ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಾಧಾರಣವಾಗಿ ಈಗ ಹತ್ತು-ಹದಿನೈದು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಹಿಂದಿನ ಯಾವ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಇನ್ಸ್‌ಪೆಕ್ಟರುಗಳು, ಸಬ್‌ಇನ್ಸ್‌ಪೆಕ್ಟರುಗಳು, ದಫೇದಾರ್, ಕಾನ್ಸ್‌ಟೇಬಲ್‌ಗಳಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅವರ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಬಹಳ ಕಟುವಾಗಿ ಟೀಕೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ಬಂದಿರುವವರೇನೋ ತಕ್ಕಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ನಿಸ್ಪೃಹರಾಗಿ, ಜನರಿಗೆ ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂಬ ಮನೋಭಾವನೆಯುಳ್ಳವರಾಗಿ ದೇಶದ ಹಿತಚಿಂತನೆ ಹೊಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಿಂದಿನವರಿಗಾದರೋ ಇದೇನೂ ಬೇಡ. ತಿಂಗಳಿಗೆ ತಾನೇನು ಸಂಪಾದನೆ ಮಾಡಬಲ್ಲೆ, ತನ್ನ ಸಂಸಾರದ ಕಷ್ಟವನ್ನು ಎಷ್ಟು ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ನೀಗಿಕೊಂಡು ಸುಖವಾಗಿರಬಲ್ಲೆ ಎಂಬ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಅವರಿಗಿದೆ. ತತ್ರಾಪಿ ಇನ್ನು ನಾಲ್ಕು-ಐದು ವರ್ಷಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ರಿಟೈರ್ ಆಗತಕ್ಕಂಥವರ ಹಾವಳಿಯನ್ನು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಲಾರೆ. 100-150 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಸಂಬಳವಾದರೆ, ಸುಲಭವಾಗಿ ತಿಂಗಳಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಸಾವಿರ, ಎರಡು ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವಂಥವರ ನಿದರ್ಶನಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಕೊಡಬಲ್ಲೆ. ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ನನಗೆ ಯಾವ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾದರೂ ಕೊಡಿ. ಆದರೆ ತೋರಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟರೂ ಸೂಕ್ತ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮೀನ-ಮೇಷ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಇಂಥ ಸರ್ಕಾರ, ಇಂಥ ಇಲಾಖೆ ಏಕಿರಬೇಕು ? ದೇಶದ ರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಮಾಡಲೆಂದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ನಾನಾ ರೀತಿಯ ಸೌಲಭ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಒಂದು ಜೀಪ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಇಷ್ಟೆಲ್ಲಾ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೂ ಅವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ ನಡೆಸದೇ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅವರಿಗೇನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ? ಜನರಿಗೆ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಕಷ್ಟ ಬಂದರೆ ಅವರು ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅದಲ್ಲದೆ, ತಮ್ಮ ಆಸ್ತಿಪಾಸ್ತಿಗಳಿಗೇನಾದರೂ ತೊಂದರೆ ಬಂದರೆ, ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಬೈದರೆ, ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಕಳ್ಳತನವಾದರೆ ಯಾವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಸ್ಟೇಷನ್ನಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದಕ್ಕೂ ಪೋಲೀಸಿನವರ ಸಹಾಯ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಬೇಕೇಬೇಕು. ಹೀಗಿರುವಲ್ಲಿ, ದೇಶದ ಜನರ ಪ್ರಾಣ, ಮಾನ, ಆಸ್ತಿಪಾಸ್ತಿ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದರ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯೂ ಈ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಬಿದ್ದಿರುವಾಗ, ಈ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಆಡಳಿತ ಸರಿಯಾಗದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಏನು ಪ್ರಯೋಜನ ? ಈ ಹೊತ್ತು ನಮ್ಮೊಡನೆ ಹೊರಗಡೆಯಿಂದ ಬಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ನಮ್ಮ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರೂ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು, 'ನೀವು ಹಳೆಯ ಮೈಸೂರಿನ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತೀರೋ ಹೊಸ ಮೈಸೂರಿನ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತೀರೋ' ಎಂದು ನನ್ನನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದರು. ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಹಳೆಯ ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ ಬಹುಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಪ್ರಾಯೋಗಿಕವಾಗಿ ನಾನೊಂದು ಸಲಹೆ ಕೊಡಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಸುಧಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದರಿಂದಲಾದರೂ ಇಲ್ಲಿನ ಪೋಲೀಸಿನವರಿಗೆ ದೇಶವನ್ನು ಕಾಪಾಡುವ ಮನೋಭಾವ ಬರುತ್ತದೋ ಎನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಪೋಲೀಸಿನವರನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಕೊಡಗು, ಮಂಗಳೂರು ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಮತ್ತು ಹೈದರಾಬಾದ್ ಭಾಗಕ್ಕೂ ಆ ಕಡೆಯವರನ್ನು ಇತ್ತ ಕಡೆಗೂ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿ ತಾತ್ಕಾಲಿಕವಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಯೋಗ ನಡೆಸಿ ನೋಡಲಿ. ಈ ಐ. ಜಿ. ಪಿ. ಆಫೀಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ವರ್ಗಾವಣೆಗಳ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಅನ್ಯಾಯಗಳು ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿವೆಯೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಬಲ್ಲೆ. ಅನೇಕ ಪೋಲೀಸಿನವರು ರಜಾ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು 20-25 ದಿವಸಗಳು ಐ. ಜಿ. ಪಿ. ಆಫೀಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾದಿದ್ದು ಲಂಚ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ತಮಗೆ ಯಾವ ಜಾಗ ಬೇಕೋ ಆ ಜಾಗಕ್ಕೆ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿರುವವರಿಗೆ ಯಾವುದೊಂದಕ್ಕೂ ಲಂಚ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿರಬೇಕು. ಹೀಗಾದರೆ ಏನು ಮಾಡುವುದು ? ಲಂಚ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ನಿದರ್ಶನಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಕೊಡಬಲ್ಲೆ. ಲಂಚ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಇಂಥ ಕಡೆಗೇ ತಮ್ಮನ್ನು ವರ್ಗ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಮಾಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಇನ್ಸ್‌ಪೆಕ್ಟರುಗಳ ಉದ್ದೇಶವೇನಿರಬಹುದೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೀವೇ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ. ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಮುಖ್ಯಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಇದರ ಕಡೆ ಗಮನ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅವರಿಗೆ ತಕ್ಕ ಎಚ್ಚರಿಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಹೊರತು ಗತ್ಯಂತರವಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಮುಖ್ಯಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನನ್ನೂ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅನೇಕ ಪ್ರಶಂಸೆಗಳು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿವೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅವರು ಇದೇ ರೀತಿ ನಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದ ಗತಿ ಏನಾಗುತ್ತದೆ? ನಾವು ಮೆಂಬರುಗಳಾಗಿರುವವರನ್ನು ದಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಾಳೆ ಹೊಡೆದರೆ ಏನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೋ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಗುರುತರ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯನ್ನು ದಕ್ಷತೆಯಿಂದ ಅವರು ನಿರ್ವಹಿಸುವಂತೆ, ಆ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ prestige ಅನ್ನು ಉಳಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವಂತೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿವರ್ಯರು ಸೂಕ್ತ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ದೇಶವನ್ನು ಕಾಪಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ನಂಬಿ ನನ್ನ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Sir, first of all I should like to know whether any non-Congressmen also are sitting on the other side because when I heard the speech of the last Hon'ble Member, I felt that he belonged to our group and not to the party in power.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Then there is no need for you to speak!

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Sir, when we speak on these three Demands, I find that the procedure that has been followed is rather different and it is difficult for us to digest it and criticise any particular Hon'ble Minister as he did not move the Demands. It is only the Speaker who has moved the Demands for Grants. It is therefore very difficult for us to criticise when the Speaker makes the demand.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member has full liberty.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—The first thing which I shall deal with is the 'Administration of Justice' While I speak on this, I recollect the basic principle on which the Government of India and our Government are established. Our Government has three pillars, *viz*,, legislative, executive and judiciary. From the questions and answers and also newspapers, we find that one of the pillars of administration, that is, the Judiciary, was practically not manned by a sufficient number of people. Thousands of cases are pending there and from 1-11-1956 several cases have been transferred to the Hon'ble High Court of Mysore. But there are not sufficient hands to deal with them. This is the main grievance not only from the members of this side but also from the other side and also the general public. Unless sufficient hands are posted it is very difficult to get speedy relief. As one of the colleagues had referred the maxim, 'Justice delayed is justice denied', has practically become true so far as dispensation of justice for the last eight months is concerned. Even now there are only five Judges and I learn that more than eight thousand cases are pending in this High Court. I cannot understand how these five Judges can dispose of such a huge work that is pending there. I presume that due to the interference of the executive there is delay in appointing the Judges. Otherwise there is no necessity or reason for our Hon'ble President not to appoint the Judges earlier. My information is that undesirable interference by the executive in these appointments has caused the delay. I request that the executive should not interfere so far as judiciary is concerned and the appointing authority should have full scope to make these appointments.

The next thing which I want to refer to is about our own part. Since we are included in this State, most of the Marathi knowing Officers of the Judiciary have been transferred to the Bombay State and only Kannada knowing people are left. Whether he be an Englishman, Frenchman or Kannada knowing man, so long as he metes out justice we are not bothered. But the experience is quite the reverse. We had a very bad experience so far as our part is concerned regarding giving justice to the Marathi people. We have had a very bad experience during the time of Sathyagraha. The Hon'ble Minister might say that Satyagraha relates to the past and this Government had no control over it. I do admit that at that time there was no Mysore Government. But, the same persons, the persons who have vindictively convicted the Marathi people are still working there as Judicial Magistrates. That fear is still there in the minds of those people. We will have a very bad experience of these persons when the question of Marathi and Kannada comes up.

5 P.M.

That should not be the case at all. Unfortunately these people who are practically guided by the Congress Committees of that place are misguided and are troubling and doing injustice to the Marathi people or the Marathi litigants. That must be stopped. That is my humble request to the Hon'ble Minister concerned.

Sri C. M. POONACHA.—Does the Hon'ble Member refer to the conduct of the judicial officers' there ?

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Yes, judicial officers.

Sri C. M. POONACHA.—I am afraid it is rather unfair that the conduct of judicial officers should have been drawn into this discussion by the Hon'ble Member inasmuch as to say that they have been rather too partial to the Kannada people and then they are not well disposed towards Marathi people. That is the point of order to which I wish to draw the attention of the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will read rule 146 which will make the question quite clear.

> "The matter of every speech must be strictly relevant to the matter before the Assembly.
>
> (2) A member while speaking must not—
>
> (*a*) refer to any matter of fact on which a judicial decision is pending; or

(MR. SPEAKER.)

(*b*) make a personal charge against a member; or

(*c*) reflect upon the Governor, the members of the Ruling Family, the President, the Governor of any State, the Ruler of any Foreign State, a Judge of a High Court in India in the discharge of his duties or any Court of Law in the exercise of its judicial functions; or

(*d*) utter treasonable, seditious, defamatory or unparliamentary words; or

(*e*) use his right of speech for the purpose of obstructing the business of the Assembly; or

(*f*) reflect on any determination of the Assembly except on a motion for amending or rescinding it; or

(*g*) discuss any ruling or direction of the Speaker or any order by the Speaker disallowing a question, resolution or motion."

Here the words are clear "any Court of Law in the exercise of its judicial functions." The Hon'ble Member cannot make any remarks against a Court of Law when it is sitting in exercise of judicial functions. So far as the judicial magistrate is concerned, his conduct naturally in exercise of his judicial functions cannot be attaked. I therefore uphold the point of order raised by the Hon'ble the Home Minister.

Sri T. TARE GOWDA (Sira).—What to do if it is a question of fact?

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is no question of fact. I am only concerned with rules. The facts may be like that or may not be like that. The rule is that the conduct of a judicial magistrate when he is exercising his power as such cannot be taken into consideration.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—As I understand, the rule refers to a particular judicial officer. So far as the proceedings of this House are concerned, no member can call into question the conduct of a particular judicial officer. But so far as general administration of justice or miscarriage of justice is concerned, is not any member entitled to refer to it?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Exactly. He is perfectly in order if he generally refers to miscarriage of justice without making any reference to any court or judicial officer while exercising his duties as such.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—That is exactly what my friend was doing. So far as particular areas are concerned, there was an apprehension of miscarriage of justiee.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He also said that those judicial officers were still there. That means he is pointing out particularly certain officers.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO (Mysore City).—Now the Demand relates to Administration of Justice. I believe that the relevant rule quoted does not refer to the court in exercise of judicial functions.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am trying to understand what the Hon'ble Member wants to convey. He means that the remarks made by the Hon'ble Member are irrelevant.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA (Gubbi).—When a ruling has been given, can it be questioned?

Mr. SPEAKER.—If it is questioning my ruling I cannot allow it. I am trying to understand what the Hon'ble Member wants to convey.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—I am asking for a clarification from the Chair whether a member is permitted to speak in general terms on administration of justice in the State without referring particularly to any court or individual. I believe I have made myself clear and I request the Speaker to enlighten me on the point.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I could not just follow what the Hon'ble Member wanted to convey. I understand that he wants to know whether an Hon'ble Member has any right to speak on the administration of justice. He has, because that is exactly what we are

dealing with the Demands relating to "27. Administration of Justice, 28. Jails and Convict Settlements and 29. Police."

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Sir, so far as Constitution is concerned, under article 211, we cannot attack the conduct of the High Court Judges. But rules prohibit us from making a reference to a court of law also. I have to accept the ruling. At the same time I must point out to the Hon'ble Minister that life and property of Marathi people are not in safe hands. They are afraid that they are not getting justice at the hands of the present administration. I request the Hon'ble Minister therefore to see that this fear in a particular section of the community will not exist in a democracy.

Then I wish to refer to the Police administration. It is a very sad story so far as our part is concerned. When I came here I just enquired about the Police administration and I may refer to the question which was answered by the Hon'ble Minister a few days back. That question is No. 146 asked by Sri C. K. Rajaiah Setty. He had asked as to how many murders were committed in a particular taluk during the last four years and the answer was, that the reported murders were 13, prosecutions launched were 11. What about convictions? Only one conviction. It means that 12 murderers had escaped, and it shows the lack of capacity, ability and the promptness of the Police Department of this State.

Sri C. M. POONACHA.—May I furnish certain information? Unfortunately that was not elicited in the supplementaries. I believe, in that area two accused died before the trial could conclude. Though the charges were framed yet conviction could not be secured because two accused subsequently died while in remand.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—It appears from the explanation given by the Hon'ble Minister that God came to give justice rather than the Administration. (*Laughter*).

God has given justice by punishing those people who were guilty. Whatever it is, the police are not active. When I came here and just enquired about the administration, I came to know that there was tremendous nepotism in this particular department. Nepotism naturally leads to inefficiency. Police officers do not feel that they have got a duty to perform. If there is one godfather clad in khadi to protect any of these officers, nobody is afraid of sleeping at home or doing any mischief. That is the experience of the people. It appears that every officer in our State is after some Gandhi caps to get protection and once he gets protection at the hands of one, he never cares for the public. In my place there was some controversy regarding the elections, as there is practically in every village, and if it is found that a particular person is a member belonging to the opposite party, his life is in danger. An application was given by such a person to the D.S.P. and to the officer in charge of the police station and he had informed the authorities that the Congress people were trying to kill him and so the poor man had sought protection. Within three or four days that man was actually murdered. But as the police officers are siding with the Congress people, they did not investigate properly and ultimately all the accused were acquitted. This is the way in which the administration of the Police Department is being carried on. If a man is not in the Congress party, his life is never safe and if he seeks protection at the hands of the police, he commits a double fault. That has become practically a proverb in our side. So, I submit that this sort of administration is not expected in a democracy and it will hamper the proper growth of democracy. I, therefore, request the Hon'ble Minister concerned to look into these matters and see that such mischiefs are not done and that the bosses who are at the back of such mischiefs are punished. Unless these bosses are punished, it is very difficult to put a check on these practices.

*Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE (Chikodi).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Demands and while doing so, I propose

(SRI S. D. KOTHAVALE)

to confine my remarks particularly to the administration of justice. Much concern was expressed in this Hon'ble House by many Hon'ble Members about the appointment of Judges to the Mysore High Court. I am glad to note that within the last few days three appointments have been made including that of the Chief Justice. I particularly welcome the appointment of Justice S. D. Das Gupta of the Calcutta High Court as the Chief Justice of the Mysore High Court. I think that his experience as a Judge of the Calcutta High Court would be very useful to this State. In this connection, my request to the Government is to get the services of experienced and eminent Judges from other High Courts for the remaining vacancies in the Mysore High Court. We are at a stage when we must build fine and great traditions for our judicial administration in the State and the services of experienced and eminent Judges from outside the State are much needed now. There is nothing wrong in getting experienced men from outside, particularly when we want to create an independent judiciary the impartiality of which will never be called in question and which would create confidence in the minds of the public. Therefore, as I said in the beginning, I welcome the appointment of an eminent Judge of the Calcutta High Court as the Chief Justice of the Mysore High Court and request that similar eminent Judges from outside should be taken to fill the remaining vacancies in the Mysore High Court. I might remind Hon'ble Members of this House that the States Reorganisation Commission has recommended that for the purpose of maintaining the independence and impartiality of judicial administration at least one-third of the Judges of the High Courts in India should be recruited from outside and in this connection a healthy precedent has been set up by the appointment of a Judge of the Calcutta High Court as the Chief Justice of this High Court. This practice should be followed and in course of time I am sure that we will have Judges of such high calibre and eminence that other High Courts in the country would make a request for the transfer of Judges from our High Courts to theirs.

It was just remarked by the Hon'ble Member Sri V. S. Patil that the real delay in the appointment of High Court Judges was due to executive interference. I do not understand what grounds he has got to express that view. It is wrong to say so. Of course, I do not know everything about it but the little that I know shows that the Chief Justice of the Mysore High Court who retired the other day was in right earnest in making the appointments as early as possible but that there was some difficulty over which the authorities had no control. Therefore, it is wrong to say that there was any executive interference and I think that we, the members of this Hon'ble House, should be very careful in making observations for which there is no reasonable ground. My friend Sri V. S. Patil is a lawyer of longstanding and I very much regret that a person of his standing should have made a remark to that effect.

With reference to the other matters connected with administration of justice at the High Court level, the position of the Advocate-General and of Assistant Advocate General is important. I am told that about three Assistant Advocates-General have been taken up and that they are all from the old Mysore area. If the Government thinks that it is necessary to appoint Assistant Advocates-General in addition to the present strength, I would request that they should be taken from the areas outside the old Mysore area.

In the interest of proper integration of the different areas in the services it is necessary to give representation to the persons from the different integrating areas. Very often cases from these integrated areas come before the High Court. Eminent lawyers practising in those areas are at the disposal of Government to argue those cases before the High Court. The services of such lawyers should be utilised by Government. So, my request to Government is that when future

recruitments are made they should be made from amongst persons in the areas outside the old Mysore State.

Then, Sir, as regards the subordinate judiciary services many complicated questions have arisen after the reorganisation of the State. The question of equating the judicial officers from one area with those in other areas has become important. It appears that this has not been justly and equitably handled. The judicial set-ups in the different areas are different. In the former Bombay area, so far as a district is concerned, there is a District and Sessions Judge on the top; below him there is the Civil Judge (Junior Division). There the Civil Judge (Junior Division) exercises jurisdiction up to Rs. 10,000 and the Civil Judge (Senior Division) exercises jurisdiction to an unlimited extent over the entire district. Their counterparts in the other areas, if my information is correct, do not exercise such a large jurisdiction over such a large territory. For instance, in old Mysore area there is the Munsiff who exercises jurisdiction up to Rs. 2,500 and the Civil Judge exercises jurisdiction up to Rs. 20,000. It appears that the Civil Judge (Junior Division) of Bombay has been equated with the Munsiff here. The Civil Judge (Junior Division) had been exercising jurisdiction up to Rs. 10,000 and over a wider area. Probably, salaries and allowances of the Civil Judge (Junior Division) of Bombay are much higher than those of the Munsiff. Therefore it is not right that the Civil Judges (Junior Division) should be equated with Munsiffs here. I submit that this is a matter which should be considered very carefully and in the light of such consideration the inter-State gradation list should be suitably revised and justice should be meted out to all.

There is another aspect so far as the Bombay area is concerned. There the Civil Judges who show extra merit are selected as Assistant Judges. A Civil Judge (Junior Division) showing extra merit, after he puts in a service of 9 or 10 years, is called for interview by the High Court and if his record is fine he is selected as Assistant Judge. When once he is appointed as Assistant Judge he exercises practically the same powers with regard to trial of murder cases and appeals, as the Sessions Judge himself and he is eligible for promotion as District Judge. That was the position in the Bombay area. Such an institution does not appear to be present either in old Mysore, Madras, Hyderabad or Coorg areas. In order that the law officers may have some incentive to show their merit, such a system of selection for posts of Assistant Judges should be retained in the new judicial set-up of the new State also. If these appointments are to be made merely on the length of service and the seniority of the person concerned, then there would not be any incentive for the lower officers to show their merit and intelligence. Therefore, I submit that the system prevailing in the Bombay area should be adopted here also.

I shall cite the case of an Assistant Judge from Bombay who has suffered as a result of the fixation of the inter-State gradation list. Of course, it would not be proper for me to name the person. A person who was on the point of being taken up as Assistant Judge was allotted to the new Mysore State as a result of States reorganisation. Within 15 days of his transfer his junior in the Bombay area was promoted as Assistant Judge and that person has now very bright chances of becoming District Judge. So this person who was transferred to Mysore has suffered and his number in the inter-State gradation list of Mysore stands much below as Civil Judge. I think that cases like this should be sympathetically considered while fixing the gradation lists and the gradation lists should be fixed having due regard to the merit and the efficiency of the persons concerned.

Further, my request to Government is that, while deciding on the judicial set up of the new State, whatever is good in the different integrating areas of the new State should be taken. On this basis I would submit that the practice of selection of Assistant Judges on the basis of merit should be adopted here.

There is another important matter to which I would like to refer. The independence of the judiciary is a

(SRI S. D. KOTHAVALE)

matter of great concern to all. We agree that the three arms of the State, namely, the judiciary, the Legislature and the executive shouldbe independent In the interest of efficient administration of the State, it is necessary that there be separation of executive and judicial functions. There is such a separatiot in the Bomaby area. I understand that there is such separation here also to a certain extent in certain areas. I request Government to consider this matter very carefully and introduce the principle of separation of the judiciary and the executive as early as possible so as to ensure an efficient and independent judiciary in the State.

Now I would like to refer to certain remarks made by the Hon'ble Sir V. S. Patil. He made a reference to certain judicial decisions in Belgaum. Then the Hon'ble Minister Sri Poonacha raised a point of order and you rightly upheld it, but I would submit that even on merits the allegations made by the Hon'ble Member Sri V. S. Patil are not at all correct. He admitted that the so-called wrong decisions were given when Belgaum was a part of the former Bombay State. If any wrong decision was given, then the doors of the High Court were open for appeal against such a decision. The Hon'ble Member has not made a reference to any such appeal made by the aggrieved person. So it was wrong on the part of the Hon'ble Member to make a reference to that case here. Such allegations should not be made with regard to judicial decisions.

SRI V. S. PATIL.—Sir, for the information of my Hon'ble friend I may say that appeals were made and the sentences were reduced as a result of the appeals. Perhaps, he does not know it.

SRI S. D. KOTHAVALE.—I know the whole case and I do not want to go into the details of the whole case here. Suffice it to say that the allegations made by the Hon'ble Member are absolutely groundless and without any foundation.

Some remarks were made with regard to the administration of the Police Department. Fortunately, the Hon'ble Member did not doubt the utility of the Police Department itself. It is not proper to take the time of the House over such petty matters of an incident here or an incident there. They should be brought to the notice of the Government and the authorities concerned and then proper steps will be taken to remedy those things.

5-30 P.M.

I am sure the Hon'ble Members can repose confidence in the Ministers and the Deputy Ministers and in their capacity to ride around, but to condemn the entire Department simply because there are a few persons here and there acting wrongfully, would not be proper. It is not my claim that the Department is absolutely free from charges. Can we say that all of us, Members of the Assembly, are free from faults? Sometimes it happens that there are defects here and there, but because of that it is not proper to criticise the entire Department. The remedy lies in bringing particular matters to the notice of the Government and getting redressed. The Department is doing very well and compares well with the police organisations in other States.

MR. SPEAKER.—Sri Narasimhan.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಲಿಂಗೇಗೌಡ (ಕನಕಪುರ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ನನಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆ ?

MR. SPEAKER.—I have a record of the members whom I called upon to speak. I have called so far 5 members, out of whom only two are from the Congress party three members are from the Opposition group. I am trying to weigh the balance in favour of the Opposition, but they cannot expect the whole weight to be in their favour.

SRI M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Before proceeding with my remarks, I would like to know, Sir, if this would be the procedure in respect of discussion of other Demands for Grants also?

MR. SPEAKER.—In what respect?

SRI M. C. NARASIMHAN.—In respect of the general discussion on Demands. Is it only in respect of this Demand that we are to follow this procedure of making generel remarks and not confine to our cut motions?

MR. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member has a wrong impression. I have said

already that Hon'ble Members may make remarks not only in a general way, but also speak on the particular cut motions tabled by them. I have not excluded that part at all. What I said was that members need not in fact move the cut motions, but the substance of the cut motions can be brought out in their speeches.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Will it be so in respect of all the Demands ?

Sri M. LINGE GOWDA.—Supposing I do not get a chance to speak on my cut motion, what will be the fate of my cut motion ? Members who have not moved cut motions get a chance. What is the use of moving a cut motion then?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Since the cut motions have been tabled and the list containing the names of the persons who have tabled them is there I would try to give them the first chance. But that does not mean that chances would not be given to other members. It is also settled now that no more cut motions will be tabled by the Hon'ble Members, but the general policy of the Government can be discussed on the Demand. Whatever particular point the Hon'ble Members may have in their heart can be divulged here. I have no objection to that, but it is not necessary to move cut motions for that purpose.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Since the other members who have moved cut motions have offered general remarks, I would also offer a few general remarks in respect of the Demands before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Any relevant remark can be made.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I can assure the Chair that I would always make pertinent remarks.

Sir, the first subject would be regarding the administration of justice. It is very well-known that administration of justice is a subject-matter which should really be beyond cavil. It is particularly so in a democratic set-up. Every one here, at least those in the ruling party, would not like to be told that the administration of justice in a particular place is something very bad. Tradition has it that so far as democracies are concerned they have evolved a system of judicial administration, which is beyond criticism. I do not think it is the tradition even in the British Parliament to spend a lot of time on criticisms of the judicial administration. If such traditions are there, if those standards have been attained there, it is for one simple reason that administration of justice itself is above board. It has reached certain standards . . .

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have to abide by the rules.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I am not calling into question the rules.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member is not prevented from making remarks about general miscarriage of justice.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I am not referring to your ruling, Sir. My remarks that follow would make clear what I have in my mind. Now, we are in a situation where we are called upon to participate in a debate very seriously and make very serious allegations about the administration of justice. It is a situation which calls for some thought. Many members here and from the ruling party definitely criticised the manner of administration of justice. Let me point out one simple thing. Take a simple matter like the question of appointment of High Court Judges. There has been much delay and everybody knows that once there is delay, it will come in for criticism in the Assembly, which is watchful of everything. It is a matter over which the ruling party must have been very concerned, if they were very serious about the democratic administration and maintenance of high standards of judicial administration. In the administration of justice they should not give room for criticism. It is not very pleasing for us to come here and criticise the administration of justice. Of course, we are here to participate in the business of the House and discuss several other matters, but judiciary is a thing which should be above board. Unfortunately, is it above board ? Every person, the several lawyers here and even the Minister for Legal Affairs, will tell us that the standard of administration of justice

(DR. M. C. NARASIMHAN).

or even jurisprudence has gone down compared to that of earlier days. I think this is an issue in respect of which we may go back to the earlier days of administration of justice. My impression is—and my discussions with my lawyer-friends have confirmed this—that the standard of judicial administration and jurisprudence in the by-gone days, when possibly British Judges were sitting along with Indian Judges who were Liberals, was very much better. It is not my view alone—history says so and eminent lawyers and judges say that things were much better then. Today it is not so. . . .

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA (Minister for Labour and Legal Affairs).—By way of explanation, I have never mentioned to my friend that he can have it on my authority to say that standards of jurisprudence have come down or that the officers dispensing justice have lowered the standards.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I thought the Hon'ble Minister would say so, but he has betrayed me (*Laughter*). Apart from this, there is one other aspect. I do not know what measures the Government proposes to take. It is an all-India matter and, so far as we are concerned, there is possibly very little that we can do. But, there is one aspect to which I would like to draw the attention of this House and to which reference has been made by many friends here, that there is political interference. There is indirect political interference. There is clandestine political interference. This is a thing which should be taken serious note of. It is a matter in respect of which I can give particular instances. But the recent history of the Mysore High Court and the recent history of those who are conversant with the Mysore affairs from several years will definitely confirm my impression that there is interference. It is a very well-known fact that there is struggle between the judiciary on the one hand and the Ministry on the other. All that was in the papers, and that was a point gossip for everybody. Why that situation was allowed to continue for a pretty long time? It goes to show the conduct of the people who rule us today.

The second aspect to which I would like to invite attention of this House is the question of cost of justice. Sir, we are moving towards socialistic society. It is said by all that justice must be as accessible as possible to the ordinary man. It should be so in practice. But now it is accessible in theory only. Anybody can point out to the laws and say that everybody can go to courts in a democratic set-up. It is all true in theory. But, in practice what happens? In practice, justice is denied to the common man by making it as costly as possible. We are levying stamp duties and we are levying a host of other duties. It would be very difficult for the common man to go to courts to seek justice. There are a host of instances. As a Trade Unionist I may tell the House that ordinary workers are not able at all to take advantage of the legal machinery—the Tribunal. What about the cost for criminal cases? What about the civil cases? It is absolutely beyond the capacity of the ordinary man. This is an aspect to which we are not at all devoting enough attention. We are devoting attention to projects; we are devoting attention to the developmental activities. I am not saying that we should not devote adequate attention to them. But, to this vital question where justice is sought to be slowly denied, in an indirect way, we are not devoting any attention. Are we trying to do them justice? No. I may draw the attention of the House to the step taken by the Kerala Government in this regard. To make justice accessible to the ordinary man, we see in papers, that the Kerala Law Minister has announced that in respect of all those who get an income of below hundred rupees, all litigations, as far as possible, would be made free. Even the legal fee would be met by the State. I am not suggesting that it should be done over-night. But, we are not thinking in that direction. If we do not think in that way, how is it possible for us to make justice accessible to the common man? Then, Sir, I need not refer to the criticism

already made by my friend about the delay involved in giving justice. It is too redundant for me to say that justice delayed is justice denied. There must be some way through which we can cut down this delay. The delay leads to complications. One of the reasons that several might be advanced for increasing the stamp value is to cut down speculative litigations. Speculative litigation arises due to delay in meting out justice. If delay can be cut down, we can cut down speculative litigation. So, avoiding delay and cutting down delay is absolutely necessary. My friend from Madras tells me that, so far as civil suits are concerned, it would not take more than two years for final disposal; so far as criminal cases are concerned, one year or even less is taken many a time for final disposal. I think, it is absolutely necessary to prescribe some such time limit—two years in the case of civil suits and within a year for criminal cases. I am sure this would offer a big relief to the litigants.

About the adequacy of courts, reference is already made. I would only add a word to what my friends have said that it is absolutely necessary to take stock of the situation such as the pending cases, and appoint as many Benches as are necessary.

So far as South Kanara is concerned, there is what is known as the Fair Rent Act. But there is no Rent Court. There are so many disputes pending between land-lords and tenants. This particular legislation was applied to South Kanara as early as 1956. Section 7 of the Act provides for constitution of a Rent Tribunal. It is a peculiar thing so far as South Kanara is concerned.

Sri B. VIKUNTA BALIGA.—May I mention, Sir, that rules are being drafted and that work is almost complete, so that point may not be lengthened ?

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Thank you very much. In repect of Police, I would like to point out a question of policy. The question of policy is this. So far as the Opposition is concerned, there is a certain discrimination in relation to the use of the police. So far as my Party is concerned, there is a specific discrimination.

Sri K. V. BYRE GOWDA (Bangalore North).—To which Party does the Hon'ble Member belong ?

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I belong to the Communist Party; Hon'ble Member knows it. Recently, Sir, there is a circular issued by the District Superintendent of Police calling for names of all Communist publications. The addresses of the sellers of this literature, the addresses of those book-stalls where in this literature is sold—all this has to go to the D.S.P. If the books are needed for the D.S.P. for education, I would have no objection. I would have been very glad, on the other hand, because it helps propaganda. But, I do not see any reason why this particular discrimination should be set against us. I do not see any policy declared by the Government of India that the Communist literature should not be sold. Then, why this circular ?

Secondly, Sir, in respect of our Party workers, especially, in Pavagada —those who work in Kisan Sabhas—discrimination is made and they are harrassed. When our Deputy Leader, Sri A. K. Gopalan had come here, there were about 20 C.I.Ds. doing Satyagraha around the house where he stayed, from morning to evening. He had come here only for rest. There were about 20 policemen, just covering and enquiring from morning till evening. Discrimination is made, Sir, even in the matter of passport. My passport was impounded. The Editor of 'Kidi' and others have been denied passports. I do not understand the attitude in doing all this. Then Sir, they say, deterrent punishment should be given in respect of prohibition cases. I may tell the House what happened in K.G.F. some time back. For the offence, a person was hand-cuffed and taken. This is one instance of deterrent punishment. If it is a question of corruption of officers, we are not prepared to give the same deterrent punishment. Recently, we hear that some Police officers have been suspended. I know for that matter, so far as some of the officers are

(SRI M. C. NARASIMHAN)

concerned—not all—I am sure, they are absolutely corrupt. In spite of that, several times they have been given very lenient punishment.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Time is up.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I conclude, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I would like to know before calling another Hon'ble Member to speak, how many of the Praja Socialist Party members are going to take part in the debate. It seems, the whole lot of them desires to take part. There should be some order. After all, the other side also should be given some chance.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಎಸ್. ಪುಟ್ಟಣ್ಣ (ತುಮಕೂರು).—ಹತ್ತು ನಿಮಿಷಗಳಿಗೆ ರೆಡ್ಯೂಸ್ ಮಾಡಿ.

Sri K. KENCHAPPA.—Instead of allowing only a few minutes, it is better they are not given a chance because it is impossible for any one to represent consistently within that time.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is what I am saying. I want to know how many Members from the Praja Socialist Party are going to take part. What I find is that there is today more order on the other side than on your side. If all the Hon'ble Members are going to take part in the debate, it is impossible for me to give a chance. The other side has intimated that only a certain number of members will take part in the debate and in that too they have left the question to the discretion of the Chair.

Sri K. KENCHAPPA.—I would have intimated that, but for the fact that there was an assurance that all those Hon'ble Members who had sent in cut motions would be given a chance. I was under the impression therefore that all those who have tabled the cut motions would be given a chance. About members who have not tabled cut motions, they may be taking chances in their own way. In that way, there is no disorder.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Venkatai Gowda, Sri V. S. Patil, Sri Narasimhan, all of them have tabled cut motions. I shall give seven minutes. if not five minutes. There is no other way. ಹತ್ತು ನಿಮಿಷ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಪ್ರಜಾಸೋಷಿಯಲಿಸ್ಟ್ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯ ಎಲ್ಲ ಸದಸ್ಯರೂ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಎಸ್. ಪುಟ್ಟಣ್ಣ —ಮೂರು ನಾಲ್ಕು ದಿವಸ ಗಳಿಂದಲೂ ನಮಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಹೇಗೆ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Then I am not responsible if anybody does not get a chance. After 7 O'clock I am not going to sit. ಹತ್ತು ನಿಮಿಷ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri M. RAMAPPA (Harihar).—In democracy, I believe, very great importance and sanctity has to be attached to the courts. With that object in view, the framers of our Constitution have given the widest powers to the High Courts and to the Supreme Courts to call into question any action of the. executive or others. Sir, I do not know whether our Ministers are aware—I am sure even if they are aware, they say they are not aware of it—I am very sorry to bring to the notice of the Minsters in general and to the Members of this House in particular that our people have absolutely no regard and respect for the courts, for the judges and for the Government and consequently for the lawyers also. Sir, we should very seriously think about this matter and this aspect as to why our people, our villagers have absolutely no regard for the courts, have no regard for the judges. I do not mean to say, when I refer to judges, that they are administering injustice. I am not reflecting upon the character of the judges or their administration of justice. I only mean, because of the very system of administration of justice, people have absolutely no regard for the courts and judges. Sir, this aspect has to be very seriously considered. I say that it is mainly due to the system of administration of justice. We have been complaining all these years, even before the advent of independence, about the system of administration of justice. I am sure, even our Congress Leaders had been criticising about the administration of British justice before we got independence. I fail to understand as to why our Government in any State and particularly in this State are not paying attention to make changes in the system of administration of justice. What is it that is administered in our courts? As we all know, it is only legal justice. It is not natural justice.

I make a remark about the fundamentals of administration of justice. We are all aware of the complaints made by the villagers that in courts a right is made a wrong and a wrong is made a right. It is not because the judges are unfair, or the lawyers are unfair; it is because what is administered in courts is only legal justice, justice according to law. If there is a contradiction of evidence, naturally the case goes even if it is a question of fact. So, we have to think about the fundamentals of administration of justice. I know that it is not fully competent for the State to go into this question but the State has got some responsibility. It should not absolve itself from its responsibility. It has to bring it to the notice of the Central Government if necessary or to the Supreme Court if necessary the views of the people in this State, the Members of this House about the system of administration of justice. Sir, it is not only because of this system of administration of justice, that is legal justice, that the people have lost respect, but it is also because of the way in which justice is administered in the courts. It has been said by my friend that it is due to the cost of justice. Sri Narasimhan has very rightly pointed it out. . . . .

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU (Cubbonpet .—I rise to a point of order. My friend is not correct in his statement. When the litigants themselves make the choice of their own advocates and when they plead a case of law, is a reflection like that in general terms admissible ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is not a point of order.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Can he make a universal remark like that ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am very sorry that the Hon'ble Member is trying to challenge the Chair. I think it is not a point of order and the Hon'ble Member is entitled to his views.

Sri M. RAMAPPA.—So, Sir, this feeling of the people that our courts are not doing proper justice is also due to the fact that the cost is too heavy.

6 P. M.

and this cost is related to the time factor. Because the case goes on for nearly a year or so, the cost will be very heavy. If the time limit is restricted. I am sure they will get justice at a very cheap and low cost. I am sure that the cost they will have to bear will be usually taken away towards the expenses of the witnesses and not for the lawyers. I am sure even 5 or 10 per cent will not be paid to lawyers; it is mostly paid towards the expenses of the witnesses they will have to bring for nearly a year or so; they will have to bring witnesses a number of times. That is regarding civil courts.

Then I wish to say something about the pecuniary jurisdiction of civil courts. It is only Rs. 3,000 in the Mysore State and in Bombay and other States it is really very high ; it is up to Rs. 10,000 or so. For a simple matter, the litigant will have to go to a distant place ; that is Sub-Court and District Court. I request that the pecuniary jurisdiction in the Mysore State may be raised to the pecuniary jurisdiction of the Munsiff's Court of Bombay and other States.

Speaking about criminal courts, I should like to bring to the notice of the Government to mode of administering justice regarding prohibition cases. The object of Government is to make the prohibition policy a success, but in our Prohibition Act most of the offences are not made punishable with imprisonment; they are made punishable with only fine and a very few of them are made compulsorily punishable with imprisonment. Secondly, every accused will be very glad to pay the fine and go away. As a matter of fact, most of the time in criminal courts is occupied in disposing of prohibition cases and absolutely no purpose is served by spending so much time over prohibition cases.

Regarding the Police, I would like to say one or two words about the Anti-Corruption Department of Government. This Anti-Corruption Department consists of the Police Sub-Inspector or Inspector. I must say these people in the Anti-Corruption Department are the

(SRI M. RAMAPPA)

Police themselves. As a matter of fact, a Sub-Inspector is expected to investigate into a case of corruption against a D.S.P., against a person who was a D.S.P. yesterday or who is going to be a D.S.P tomorrow. How can we expect an impartial enquiry by a Sub-Inspector when his own boss is involved ? So I make a request to the Government that a separate department not connected with the Police should be established for making enquiries into cases of corruption against Police officers. I emphasise this aspect because it is an admitted fact that corruption is rampant in the Police Department Government has to take it very seriously, because due to this corruption as a matter of fact, prohibition policy has not been a success. There are many more matters which I wish to deal with, but unfortunately I have no time. I request the Government not to entrust the work of the Anti Corruption Department to the Police people, but to entrust it to some non-officials who are men of integrity and character and see that the Department works very efficiently.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—I will be very brief. While upholding the Demand, I cannot agree first of all with my learned friend Sri Puttaramiah who says that we must dispense with the Police wholesale. I do not think whether he can exist in this world while dispensing with the Police.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA.—I want to tell my friend that the people were long existing even before the Police were appointed.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—I would have agreed with him if he had only told us " Let there be certain measures of economy and let there be a certain amount of efficiency also in this Department " because I will just cite two instances where an effort could be made to bring about certain economy as well as efficiency. With regard to the Police Depart ment, there are certain disparities that have cropped up on account of the various administrations coming together and I find in the consolidated list of appointments that was published in the Gazette bringing out a sort of Civil List that one very shortly—perhaps there were only one or two places just above him—all of a sudden on account of the integration of new areas, the man runs down to about 20th or 21st place in the list. I just want this House to consider this aspect. Perhaps for a long time, I think, his prospect of becoming a D.S.P. is completely barred and what is going to be the repercussion of such an act ? He has no prospects. How can any one at the same time expect efficiency from him ? I may cite several names. It is not necessary. The Civil List will disclose them. That is one thing.

Secondly, the Department has bifurcated what is called the Reserve from the administration side. What has happened there also is just the same. You have kept open the D.S.P.'s place in the Reserve, but you bring in another man to fill up that. Would it be correct ? I humbly suggest that when you make bifurcation of this force, why not give seniority and fill up from the separate detached department of the reserve only or the M.A.R.P. as they call it. There is no initiative, inducement or anything to bring about efficiency. Therefore, I request that this order of the Civil List that has been published in the Gazette will have to be thoroughly gone into, must be gone into in such a way that service considerations and efficiency will be kept in view at the time of sanctioning promotions or placing them again in a proper priorty list. That is my first submission.

Then coming to " Administration of Justice," there is no doubt that 'justice delayed is justice denied.' To a certain extent we have gone about in that way and there is every suspicion that what we have done has not come up to the expectations, for whose fault, we do not know. But the point I would like to stress to-day is this. We have been for some time talking about the separation of the judiciary from the executive. Have we succeeded and if so, to what extent ? After several years there is an attempt made, but not a very successful attempt. We had very

recently what is called the Report of the Mallappa Committee.

Irrespective of whatever that comes, at least in the interest of justice, I say that a major portion of these recommendations must be implemented. I give one instance Sir. There is the Process Server. He is not sincere, or doing his duty properly. When you ask him, he says that he is not being paid his proper allowance. Perhaps, there is no allowance worth the name. That is just one illustration I am placing before the House. I can cite any number of such instances. A few months ago, we had the Setalwad Committee coming round. That was a Committee constituted by the Government of India and even our Ministers and the Chief Minister gave evidence before that Committee. If we were to wait for the Report of that Committee for the relief of these things and for toning up justice, I should say that, it will take years and years. In these small matters, we have the Mallappa Committee Report which is veryhandy. It can be implemented forthwith. It conforms to local circumstances and environments and I am sure if the major recommendations are adopted by the Cabinet and the Government, it should be possible to tone up the administration of justice.

Sir, it is unfortunate that I must again plead, whatever be the drawbacks that may be attaching to the Police Department, they are still a neglected lot. The Government has certainly done something for the non-gazetted officers with regard to their emoluments by giving them certain pay scales. I wish very humbly to ask our Hon'ble Minister in charge what he has done to our constabulary. Still the matter is pending. It is in a big ocean I am told. Still they say, not much relief is given to the lower cadre.

Sri C. M. POONACHA.—Sir, I think the Hon'ble Member is aware of the pay scale revision of the Police Department too.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Have they been given at all today, I want to know.

Government is silent about it. Well Sir, there is the question of providing housing facilities there. What is it that has been done to these people ? A constable getting Rs. 50 when he retires, he is literally on the road. We have not given him any relief. What is it that has been done to him ? These are the things that have not been done. These are the things that have not been given and still we talk of what is called, efficiency ! Give them the right thing and demand what you expect of them. Therefore, I find, sitting as I do on the side of the Government, there are certain laches, certain short-comings that I have to endure. Justice has not been done. I am not saying that because justice has not been done, they should be allowed to be corrupt in their activities. Not that. What I say is that greater responsibility lies on us to give them their due and at the same time to insist on efficiency and honesty.

Therefore Sir, with these observations, I say that, if only certain amenities and facilities are provided to them, it is certainly possible to tone up the administration of police. With regard to the administration of justice, there is much to be done in the direction of separation of judiciary from the executive and also we have to wait for certain all-India recommendations from the Setalwad Committee. But that should not stand in the way of implementing the recommendations of the Mallappa Committee.

Sri V. SREENIVASA SETTY (Coondapur).—Sir, I wanted to say something about the courts as well as the police. But unfortunately since the time allowed is so short, I would like to reverse the order and say something about the police first and the courts last, if there is any time.

I fully agree with my Hon'ble friend who has just spoken in regard to several things. The lot of the police, at any rate the lower category, is a very very hard one. I have practised in criminal courts for the last 20 years and I have personal knowledge of the life of several police constables in the district and theirs is indeed a hard lot. Poverty seems to beget more children and constables unfortunately have more children to lookafter with less pay. Their pay is just Rs. 30 plus D.A. which is not

(SRI V. SREENIVASA SETTY)

enough for them to maintain themselves. I am told that in my district for the last four months they have not been paid their D. A. at all. I do not know whether it is a fact. There may be revision of their pay-scales but that by itself does not bring solace to the police constables unless they actually get the money. I should like to say one thing. As regards corruption, I agree with the observations of most of the Members and say that there is a hundred times more corruption today, than there was formerly, more so than during the British period. But that is not a justification for giving low pay. What I am suggesting is that you should scrap the whole system of police administration as it exists today. We have copied so much rom the British people. The Hon'ble Speaker just now said that we copied several things from Britain. Why don't you copy the British system of police administration ? A constable in England can become the Commissioner of London. What is the status of a constable here and what can he become here ? He may reach a maximum pay of 50 and die at 50 or 60. Don't we read in several books that in England a P. C. becomes a Commissioner of Police ? He gets a very high pay and comparatively there is very little difference between the P.C. and the Commissioner of Police so far as pay is concerned. I know that in several cases, with due respect to a few exceptions, in India they are almost illiterate. A Police constable by name Narayana sometimes writes down his name as Nayana—*ra* is omitted there. We are continuing the old system in a worse form. What can one expect of an illiterate man like that ? How can one expect him to enforce the laws in a proper manner ? Why should we not copy the British system of police administration in this respect also ? The police administration is the one thing to which we have got to pay our first attention. With due respect to Gandhiji and his cult of non-violence, I do not think any administration could be carried on in the world without an efficient police system. You have got to enforce prohibition. There will be murder cases, everything will be there. Without police, how can we go on as a state ? With all the teachings of Mahatma Gandhi and with all the gospel of Ahimsa, can we get on without the police ? I will give you a few suggestions.

My idea is that we should scrap the whole system of police administration and no constable should be less than an S.S.L.C. My point is that there is no use having these constables. Can they function in the manner we expect them to function in the present circumstances of the country ? You must look into this matter in a sort of original way. Even after ten years of Independence, saying that we are a democracy, we have heen still following all these primitive things. When we want to copy the British system of parliamentary democracy, why not we copy the British system of police administration ? and if there is one thing in that administration which is best, it is the British police system. I read some time ago that Mr. A. G. Kher and Pandit Nehru were going along in the London streets when they were students and found an ass lying dead in the street. Pandit Nehru who was young at that time, went to a British Bobby and asked him to remove it. The Bobby said, "I will remove it immediately, Sir". Can we say that of the police here ?

After ten years, you find that not even one decent person is willing to go to a Police Station even now. I know that the police are good people. But, Sir, have you ever known a woman or a boy or a child going to the Police Station and saying that he or she was hurt or that he or she was beaten and therefore it should be investigated. If so what is the difference ? Let the Hon'ble Home Minister go in disguise to a Police Station and then he will find out the information for himself how the Police Constable or the Head Constable or the Sub-Inspector will treat him. I say that the Police Constable should be given good education, the same kind of education that is prevailing in England. I suggest that the whole administration has to be re-organised and re-orientated. Their pay has to be raised at least to Rs. 100. There is corruption, I know.

But I sympathise with them. I know that they cannot get on without corruption. Can a man getting Rs. 30 a month provide for his family when people getting three or four thousand find it difficult? We have got all information and we have our own knowledge. Big people, people in high places take thousands of rupees of bribe and the poor constable takes two rupees or one rupee or even ten annas or four annas. But how can he geton with Rs. 30? I really sympathise with him. There is wholesale bribery. But, Sir, you have to look into this. Unless you look into that matter the whole State will go to dogs. Your administration, your anti-corruption department and all other things are mere bosh. Without good Police administration we cannot get on. I say, Sir, that you have to look into this. You have to appoint a committee. You have to re-organise the system or re-orientate it. You have got to begin from the bottom and not from the top. You are giving fat D.As to bigger people. But you do not look to the welfare of the poor Police Constable. Every now and then, when I meet a Police Constable, he says "what am I to do Sir? Can I get better pay? Can I get better D.A.? It is said that orders had been passed for higher D.A.; can I get that Sir? I have not got my D.A. for four months, when can I get it? Sir? Am I going to get the increase in pay as published in papers Sir?" I said I would raise a cry in the House about all these questions. My friend Hon'ble the Home Minister of course will make fun and say that it is a drama. I really am sorry for my friend's statement, which seems to have been made in a mood of levity that it is a drama "Sadarama" Drama. I am really sorry for my friend. It is not with any such idea of enacting 'Sadarama' Drama that criticism is made. I want the Government to help the Police, especially the poor Police Constable, but not the bigger people. I say do not give more than Rs. 1,000 or Rs. 1,500 to the people in the higher ranks. You are talking of Gandhiji and raising his name every now and then. He never said that very fat salaries should be given to the high officers. In fact he said that no one should be paid more than Rs. 500. But you are not following him in this respect. I say you may give Rs. 1,000 or Rs. 1,500, but why do you give only Rs. 30 to the poor Police Constable? My humble submission is that you have to look into the Police system completely and appoint a committee and take steps for raising the standards of the Police Also, there must be scope for promotion. You copy other things from England. But why not this? You see from various literature on this subject that in England, every Police Constable can rise high and go up. If there is that scope for promotion you will see that graduates will be ready to become Police Constables. I say that, that thing has to be looked into and there should be a radical reform.

I would like to say something about the Judiciary. I do not want to dilate much on this. All the difficulty that we are feeling in the Judiciary in the State is due to communalism. I say that if you eschew communalism in the Judiciary, it will become all right. One wants that his community should be represented as judges, that his community should provide munsiffs and that his community should supply prosecutors and so on. Another man wants his community should supply the candidates. If this communal business is eschewed, the judiciary will become all right. I request you, disciples of Mahatma Gandhi, you who might have done a lot of things, to eschew communalism. I say do not interfere with the judiciary. Let it be as in England. In England, it is the Chancellor who appoints judges.

Sir, these are the only two suggestions I make. On account of want of more time, I shall limit my remarks. I hope these things will be taken note of and considered in all seriousness. I have done.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR (Belgaum City).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I will limit my observations to the grievances, hardships and handicaps that the Marathi people have to undergo in the Belgaum district. The Hon'ble Member Sri Kothavale criticised some of the remarks made by the Hon'ble Member Sri V. S. Patil. Sri V. S. Patil stated

(SRI B. R. SUNTHANKAR)

simply facts and the bitter experience that we were undergoing in our parts. The Hon'ble Member Sri Kothavale seems to be ignorant of the situation at Belgaum. Fortunately he belongs to the favoured class of Kannadigas in our district and belongs to the ruling party. He does not understand the pangs of suffering of the Marathi people in our district. He should have been born as a Marathi-speaker. He should have been born in a Marathi family and stayed at Belgaum ; then he would have understood what it means to be a Marathi-speaker. We Marathi people, I submit, Sir, are virtually under a Police raj in the new Mysore State. I am not exaggerating, twisting or misrepresenting things. I want to state simple and bare facts here. The Police force in the district is arrayed against the Marathi people. We are looked upon with suspicion and as goondas. Why ? Because we agitate for a just cause and we agitate peacefully and democratically for our right to be integrated with Maharashtra. On 1st November, at the time of the inauguration of the new Mysore State, strong Police forces to the strength of three to four thousand including a large number of armed guards were stationed at Belgaum. They were ordered from other districts and stationed at Belgaum and other places. At that time Belgaum town assumed the shape of a Police camp. The whole Marathi area looked as if it was an occupied territory in times of war. The expenditure on petrol that the Government had to incur on that single day amounted to Rs. 4,000. Why was all this show of force ? It was simply to terrorise and to threaten into submission the Marathi people. What did the Marathi people do on that day ? They observed a peaceful hartal, took out a silent procession, pin-drop silent procession of 30,000 men and women two miles long.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I think that this State was not born on that day.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—It was born on the first of November 1956.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You are talking of 1st of November, of that very day !

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Yes, Sir, on the day of inauguration of this State, we took out a procession of 30,000 men and women and held a meeting of 50,000 people. It was a protest meeting. It was only a peaceful demonstration and it was quite in an orderly manner. Not a single untoward incident happened on that day or either a few months previous to or after that. I am not exaggerating when I say that it is a sin to be a Marathi-speaker in our district.

6. 30. P. M.

Our civil liberties are curtailed. Section 144 is clamped on us for months and months together. We cannot hold any meeting or take out any procession without the previous permission of the District Magistrate. We are not given the permission to use even the microphones at our meetings. Because, we are told that large crowds would gather if permission for microphones is given. This is another form of banning our meetings. There is harassment of the Marathi people by the Police under some pretext or other and particularly the members of the Maharashtra Ekikaranna Samiti. Marathi people are roped in criminal proceedings. Young boys, even if they happen to cough in the streets, are taken to the police custody and detained for hours together. These are bare facts. My Hon'ble friend Sri S. D. Kothavale should bear in mind that these are bare facts You may be surprised that I myself was one of the accused against whom charge sheet is not sent up in what is known as the Maharashtra State Conspiracy case or popularly known as the 'Bomb Case'. If that happens to a responsible person like myself, you may imagine the fate of others. The Police in Belgaum District are dictated by the District Congress Committee and not by the higher officers. Particularly the C. I. D. is constantly engaged in bringing the Marathi people into trouble. The Congress Committee and the Police Department, particularly the C. I. D. Branch, are always manouvering and conspiring against the Marathi people.

AN HON'BLE MEMBER.—Sir, he is reading the speech.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It looks as if the Hon'ble Member is reading the speech.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—I am not reading, Sir. I am referring to my notes.

Mr. SPEAKER.—At least the Hon'ble Member may not look into the notes too often. Looking into the notes too often gives the impression that the Hon'ble Member is reading his speech.

Sri B. R SUNTHANKAR.—Some of the Police Officers are always found in the office of the District Congress Committee taking active part in the proceedings and activities of the Committee. I may refer particularly to one Police Prosecutor at Belgaum. He is staying there for the last ten years. There have been accusations in the Press against him and some responsible members of the public have sent in applications requesting the Government to transfer this person. He was a Food Inspector during the war time and was appointed as a Police Prosecutor ten years back. He is still there. There is a salutory rule that no Government Officer should be posted to one place for more than three years. But this Police Prosecutor has been a favourite of the Government and the ruling party and he is stationed there con inuously for 10 years. It seems to me that there is a bigger conspiracy against the Marathi people. The District Congress Committee, the C. I. D. of Belgaum and Kannada papers of Hubli and Dharwar are all against the Marathi people. The Congress Committee and the C. I. D. decide to take a move. The Kannada Papers raise a hue and cry against the Marathi people and we are surprised to find that the move is materialised by the Mysore Government after a few days. I may quote an instance. The Collector and the District Su erintendent of Police of Belgaum happened to be Marathi-speaking. Some members from the District Congress Committee sent a telegram to the Chief Minister that these officers should be transferred. Within eight days we found that these officers were transferred, simply because they were Marathi-speaking. With these observations I finish, Sir.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ.ಎಸ್. ಸೂರ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣರಾವ್.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದಿರುವ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಂಗ ಮತ್ತು ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಬೇಡಿಕೆಗಳ ಸಂಬಂಧವಾಗಿ ಕೆಲವು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಇಷ್ಟಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಮೊದಲನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಜ್ಯುಡಿಷಿಯಲ್ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದಿದೆ. ಶ್ರೀ ಕೋಥಾವಳಿಯವರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ, ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ನಿಧಾನವಾದರೂ, ನಮ್ಮ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಶ್ರೇಷ್ಠ ನ್ಯಾಯಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಮೂರು ಜನ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಧೀಶರನ್ನು ನೇಮಕಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಸಂತೋಷದ ವಿಚಾರ. ಆದರೆ ನಿಧಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಇದೇ ಒಂದು ಮೇಲ್ಪಂಗ್ತಿಯಾಗದೆ ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಬಾಕಿ ಭರ್ತಿಯಾಗಬೇಕಾದ ಸ್ಥಾನಗಳನ್ನೂ ಆದಷ್ಟು ಬೇಗನೆ ಭರ್ತಿಮಾಡಲು ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಸೂಚನೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಒಟ್ಟು ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಒಂಬತ್ತೇ ಆಗಲಿ, ಹತ್ತೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಆದಷ್ಟು ಜಾಗ್ರತೆ ಮಾಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಬಹಳ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ, ಅನೇಕ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ 'Justice delayed is justice denied' ಎಂದ ಹಾಗಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈಗ ಆಗಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಗಳು ಸತ್ತುಹೋದಮೇಲೆ ಅವರ ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಮೊಮ್ಮಕ್ಕಳ ಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ನ್ಯಾಯ ದೊರಕಿಸಿಕೊಡುವ ಪದ್ಧತಿ ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಬರಬಾರದೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA.—I want some clarification. I would like to know whether the Hon'ble Member is speaking for or against the Demand.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Ho'nble Member may just wait.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಕೆ. ಸೂರ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣರಾವ್.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಈಗ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಧೀಶರನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಂಡಿಯಾದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟಿನ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಧೀಶರನ್ನು ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ವರ್ಗಮಾಡುವ ಪದ್ಧತಿ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಆ ಸತ್ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಬೆಳೆಯುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ ಹೊರಗಡೆಯವರೂ, ಮೈಸೂರಿನವರು ಹೊರಗಡೆಗೂ ಹೋಗಿ ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಸಾಧುವಾದುದು. ಆರೀತಿ ಆಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕ ವಾತಾವರಣವನ್ನು ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಆಮೇಲೆ ನ್ಯಾಯ ಪರಿಪಾಲನೆಯ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಮಾತು ಹೇಳ ಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗ ಕೆಲವು ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನು ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ತೀರ್ಮಾನಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಬಹಳ ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಇವೆಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಸಿವಿಲ್ ಕೋರ್ಟುಗಳಿಗೆ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಒಂದು ಉದಾಹರಣೆಯಾಗಿ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ ಮೈಸೂರು ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಟೆನೆನ್ಸಿ ಕೋರ್ಟಿದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಒಬ್ಬರು ಜಮೀನ್ದಾರರು ಅರ್ಜಿ ಹಾಕಿದರು. ಅದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಜಮೀನ್ದಾರನ ಒಂದು written statement ವಿನಾ ರೈತನ objection statement ಯಾವುದೂ ದಾಖಲಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಜಡ್ಜಿಯವರು ಜಮೀನ್ದಾರನ statement ಮೇಲೆಯೇ ಕೇಸಿನ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಸ್. ಸೂರ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣರಾವ್.)

ವಿದ್ಯಮಾನವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡು, ರೈತನನ್ನು ಜಮೀನು ಬಿಡಬೇಕಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಜಮೀನ್ದಾರರ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಹಾಕಿದ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ವಜಾಮಾಡಿದರು. ಇಂಥ ನಿದರ್ಶನಗಳು ಅನೇಕವಾಗಿವೆ. ಇಂಥದು ಆಗಬಾರದು. ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಸಿವಿಲ್ ಕೋರ್ಟುಗಳಿಗೆ ಇಂಥ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟು ಆದಷ್ಟು ಜಾಗ್ರತೆ ಇವುಗಳನ್ನು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಒಂದು ಸೂಚನೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ.

ಮತ್ತೆ ಕೆಲವು ಅಪಾಯಿಂಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟುಗಳ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಹೇಳಿದರು.—"ನಾವು ದಕ್ಷತೆಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯತೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೇ ಶಿವಾಯಿ—ಇವರು ಹೊರಗಿನವರು, ಇವರು ಮೈಸೂರಿನವರು ಎನ್ನತಕ್ಕ ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ಭಿನ್ನಭಾವನೆಗೂ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರಬಾರದು" ಎಂದು. ನಾನಾದರೂ ಅದೇ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವುಳ್ಳವನಾಗಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ದಕ್ಷರಾದವರು ಅವರು ಯಾರೇ ಆಗಲಿ—ಯಾವ ಮತಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿರಲಿ ಅವುಗಳೊಂದಕ್ಕೂ ಮನಸ್ಸುಕೊಡದೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಜನಸೇವೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ನೀಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗ ತಾವು ನಮ್ಮ ಹೈ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ದಕ್ಷರಾದಂಥ ಮೂವರು ಅಡ್ವೋಕೇಟರನ್ನು ನೇಮಕಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಅವರು ಯಾವ ಪ್ರದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದವರೇ ಆಗಿರಲಿ ಅವರಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ದಕ್ಷತೆ, ಪ್ರಾಮಾಣಿಕತೆ ಇತ್ಯಾದಿಗಳಿಗೆ ನಾವು ಬೆಲೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ದಕ್ಷತೆಗೆ ಪ್ರಾಧಾನ್ಯತೆ ಕೊಡುವುದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಅನುಮೋದಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಆದರೆ ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಅಂಶವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈಗ ತಯಾರಿಸುತ್ತಿರುವ ಇಂಟರ್-ಸ್ಟೇಟ್-ಗ್ರೇಡೇಷನ್ ಲಿಸ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಹಳೆಯ ಮೈಸೂರಿನ ನೌಕರರಿಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆಯೆಂಬ ಕೂಗನ್ನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅಂಥಾದ್ದಕ್ಕೇನಾದರೂ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದ್ದರೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾದಷ್ಟು ಅದನ್ನು ನಿವಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ನ್ಯೂನತೆಯನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಹೋಗಲಾಡಿಸದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಹಳೆಯ ಮೈಸೂರಿನ ನೌಕರರಿಗೆ ದೊರೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದ ಬಡ್ತಿ ಹೊರಗಡೆಯಿಂದ ಬಂದವರಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಇವರಿಗಿದ್ದ ಛಾನ್ಸ್ ತಪ್ಪಿಹೋಗುವಂಥ ಅವಕಾಶವೀಗ ಉಂಟಾಗಿದೆ. ಮೇಲಾಗಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಹಳೆಯ ಮೈಸೂರಿನ ನೌಕರರಿಗೂ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಬಂದು ಸೇರಿದ ನೌಕರರಿಗೂ ಸಂಬಳಸಾರಿಗೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹಳ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸ ಕೂಡ ಇದೆ. ಆದಪ್ರಯುಕ್ತ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ನಮ್ಮ ನೌಕರರ ಸರ್ವೀಸ್ ಕಂಡೀಷನ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ವಿಧವಾದ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯೂ ಆಗದಂತೆ ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಇವರನ್ನು ರಕ್ಷಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ನ್ಯಾಯಾಂಗವನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಯಾಂಗದಿಂದ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕಿಸುವ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಅತ್ಯಗತ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದಂಥ ಕೆಲವು ಸುಧಾರಣೆಗಳು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಬಾರದೆ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ನಿಂತುಹೋಗಿವೆ. ಈವರೆಗೂ ಹಿಂದೆ ಆಚರಣೆಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಂತೆ ಪೋಲೀಸಿನವರೇ ಕ್ರಿಮಿನಲ್ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ದಾಖಲು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅನಂತರ ಅವರೇ ಆ ಕೇಸುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಇರಬಾರದು. ಇದು ನ್ಯಾಯಸಮ್ಮತವಾದ ಮಾರ್ಗವಲ್ಲ. ಇದನ್ನು ತಪ್ಪಿಸುವಂತೆ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರು. ಆದರೆ ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಅದು ಇನ್ನೂ ಕಾರ್ಯಗತವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಆದಷ್ಟು ಬೇಗ ಸರಿಪಡಿಸಬೇಕು. ಇದಾದರೇನೇ ಕ್ರಿಮಿನಲ್ ಅಡ್ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಷನ್ ಆಫ್ ಜಸ್ಟೀಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಗಳಿಗೆ ನ್ಯಾಯ ದೊರೆಯಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಿರುತ್ತದೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಇಲಾಖಾ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ನಾಲ್ಕು-ಐದು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದಲೂ ಉನ್ನತ ಅಧಿಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಂಥ ಎರಡು ಮೂರು ಜನ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಈಗ ತೊಂದರೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಿಕ್ಕಿ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಒಂದು ನಿದರ್ಶನ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಇಲಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಲೋಪದೋಷಗಳನ್ನು ಎತ್ತಿ ತೋರಿಸುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಈ ಇಲಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಲಂಚಗೂಳಿತನ ದಿನದಿನಕ್ಕೂ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆಯನ್ನುವುದರಬಗ್ಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಹೇಳಿದರೂ ಸಾಲದಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಅನಾಯಕತ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವೇನೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಕೂಲಂಕಷವಾಗಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಮಾಡಿ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಲೋಪದೋಷಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ನಿವಾರಣೆಮಾಡಿ ಈ ಇಲಾಖೆಗೊಂದು ಹೊಸಚೈತನ್ಯ ಉಂಟಾಗತಕ್ಕರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ನಡೆಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮಮೂಲಕ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಲ್ಲಿ ಮನವಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಯಾವತ್ತು ಸಹ ಒಂದು ಕ್ಲುಪ್ತವಾದ ಕಾಲಾವಧಿಗಿಂತ ಮೀರಿ ಒಂದು ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಖಂಡಿತ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬಾರದೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನನ್ನ ಕೆಲವು ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಬೆಳಗಾವಿಯ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಕೆಲವು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಆರೀತಿ ಡೆಮಾನ್‌ಸ್ಟ್ರೇಷನ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದುದನ್ನು ತಪ್ಪಿಸಬೇಕಾದುದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಆದ್ಯ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯವಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಹಾಗೆ ಅವರು ಅದನ್ನು ತಪ್ಪಿಸದೆ ಇದ್ದಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದರಿಂದ ಅನೇಕವಾಗಿ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರಿಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗತಕ್ಕ ಸಂಭವವಿತ್ತು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಹುಕುಂ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಪೋಲೀಸರು ನಡೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಾಗಿರುವಾಗ ನನ್ನ ಆ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಆರೀತಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರವನ್ನು ದೂರವುದು ಯಾವ ನ್ಯಾಯವೋ ನನಗಂತೂ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಇನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಜೈಲು ಸುಧಾರಣೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನನ್ನ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿನ್ನೂ ಆಚರಣೆ ತರಬೇಕಾದಂಥ ಕೆಲವು ಸುಧಾರಣೆಗಳಿದ್ದೇ ಇವೆ. ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಜೈಲುಗಳಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ಅವಧಿ ಪೂರೈಸಿದ ಅನಂತರ ಹೊರಗಡೆ ಹೋಗತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಅಪರಾಧಿಗಳ ಮನಸ್ಸು ಮತ್ತು ಅವರ ಭಾವನೆಗಳು ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯಾಗತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ಮಾರ್ಪಾಡನ್ನೂ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದಾವರ್ತಿ ಜೈಲಿಗೆ ಬಂದ ಮನುಷ್ಯನಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತೆ ಜೈಲಿಗೆ ಬರಲು ಆಗದಿರುವಂಥ ಒಗ್ಗದಿರುವಂಥ ಒಂದು ಮನೋಭಾವ ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ಉಂಟಾಗುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದದ್ದು ಅತಿ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಅಂಶ. ಈರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಜೈಲುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಸುಧಾರಣೆಗಳಾಗಬೇಕು. ಜೈಲಿಗೆ ಬಂದ ಖೈದಿಗೆ ಅವನು ಜೈಲನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟುಹೋಗತಕ್ಕ ವೇಳೆಯೊಳಗಾಗಿ ಅವನಿಗೆ ತನ್ನ ಜೀವನೋಪಾಯವನ್ನು ಯಾವುದಾದರೊಂದು ನ್ಯಾಯಮಾರ್ಗದಲ್ಲಿ ದುಡಿದು ತಾನೂ ಸಹ ಇತರ ಸತ್ಪ್ರಜೆಗಳಂತೆ ಜೀವನ ಸಾಗಿಸುವಂಥ ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶ ಅವರಿಗೆ ದೊರೆಯುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನೀಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಸೂಚನೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗಬೇಕಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸುಧಾರಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಗೆ

ಆಚರಣೆಗೆ ತರಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುವ ಹಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವರು ತಾವೇ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು—ಹಾಗೊಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ವಿರಾಮವಿಲ್ಲದಪಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ತಜ್ಞರ ಸಮಿತಿಯನ್ನಾದರೂ ಅವರು ನೇಮಿಸಲೇಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಲಹೆಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ದಕ್ಷತೆ ನಶಿಸಿಹೋಗುತ್ತಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಚಿತ್ರ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಗಳೇ ಕಾರಣ. ಆ ವಿಚಿತ್ರ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಗಳಾವುವೆಂದರೆ ಮದ್ಯಪಾನ ಮತ್ತು ಇನ್ನು ಕೆಲವು ಅನೀತಿಗಳು. ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಪಾನನಿರೋಧವನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತಾರದಿರುವುದೂ ಸಹ ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ದಕ್ಷತೆ ನಶಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಕಾರಣವಿದೆ. ಮೊನ್ನೆತಾನೆ ನಡೆದ ಮಹಾಚುನಾವಣೆಗಳ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ನನ್ನ ಅನುಭವಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಂಥ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದು ನಾನು ನನ್ನ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ದಿನೇದಿನೇ ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ (ಗ್ಯಾಂಬ್ಲಿಂಗ್ ಡೆನ್ ಗಳು) ದ್ಯೂತಾಗಾರಗಳು ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತಿವೆ. ಇವುಗಳ ಹೆಚ್ಚುವಿಕೆಯಿಂದ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ವ್ಯಭಿಚಾರದ ಹಾವಳಿ ಬೇರೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. (ನಗು!) ಆದರೆ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನನ್ನ ಕೆಲವು ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ನಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇದು ಖಂಡಿತ ಹಾಗೆ ನಗತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಪ್ರಸಂಗವಲ್ಲ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೂ ಮತ್ತು ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯವರೂ ಈ ವಿಚಾರದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತೀವ್ರ ಗಮನ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದದ್ದು ಅತ್ಯಗತ್ಯ. ಸಮಾಜದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಂಥ ಅಕೃತ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಆಚರಿಸತಕ್ಕವರಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶಕೊಡಬಾರದು. ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ನಾನು ಬಹಳ ವಿಷಾದದಿಂದ ತಮ್ಮಮುಂದೆ ನಿವೇದನೆಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ನಾವೂ-ನೀವೂ ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಸುಮ್ಮನಿರುವಂಥ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲ ಇದು. ಇದರಿಂದ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಜನರು ನೀತಿಬಾಹಿರರಾಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾನು ಮೊನ್ನೆ ನಡೆದಂಥ ಚುನಾವಣೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಪಡೆದ ಅನುಭವದಿಂದ ಈಗ ನಾನು ಈ ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇಷ್ಟು ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿ ನಾನು ಈ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡನ್ನು ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸಿ ನನ್ನ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

(*Several Members rose*)

MR. SPEAKER.—Sri K. H. Venkata Reddy. Tomorrow also we may continue and finish these Demands and afterwards take up Demand No. 13 General Administration. After all, the last day is meant for the guillotine. I do not mind how many subjects you discuss. It is left to the members. I am not going to be hard and fast in these matters.

ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಷ್ಟು ಬಿಗಿಯಾಗಿರಲು ನನಗೆ ಇಷ್ಟವಿಲ್ಲ. ತಮಗೆ ಇಷ್ಟವಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದೇ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡಿನ ಮೇಲೆ ನಾಳೆಯೂ ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡಿ. ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೂ ತಮಗೆ ತೃಪ್ತಿ ಆಗದಿದ್ದರೆ ನಾಳಿದ್ದೂ ಸಹ ಇವುಗಳ ಮೇಲೆಯೇ ತಾವು ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಸಬಹುದು. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನನ್ನ ಅಭ್ಯಂತರವೇನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ (ಮೈಸೂರು).—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ ತಾವು ಈ ದಿವಸದ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡುಗಳನ್ನು ಏಳು ಗಂಟೆಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಓಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಕುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೇ ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಇಲ್ಲ. ನಾಳೆ ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

Tomorrow also these Demands will be discussed for some time and "General Administration" will be taken up afterwards because many members are going to speak on these Demands.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ . . . .

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಹಾಗೆ ಸರಿಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾನೂ ಹೇಳುವವನೇ.

I agree with the Hon'ble Member that it is not proper to carry them over. If it is the desire of the members, they can be carried over.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಹೆಚ್. ವೆಂಕಟರೆಡ್ಡಿ (ಗೌರೀಬಿದನೂರು).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಈ ದಿನ ಹಳೆಯ ಮೈಸೂರಿನ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅನ್ಯಾಯಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣಕರ್ತರು ಯಾರು ಏನು ಎಂಬ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಿಂತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಆಗಲೇ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಬೋರಣ್ಣ ಗೌಡರು ನಮ್ಮ ಹಳೆಯ ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ 100ಕ್ಕೆ 90 ಭಾಗ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಅನ್ಯಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ, ಕೆಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಕೆಡುವುದಕ್ಕೂ, ಅನ್ಯಾಯಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಏನು ಕಾರಣ, ಏಕೆ ಕೆಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಅವರು ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ಅದನ್ನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಹೇಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈಗ ಮೈಸೂರು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದರೆ, 1947ಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಈಗಿನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ದೊಡ್ಡ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಲೀಡರ್‌ಗಳಾಗಿದ್ದರು. ಅವರು ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಮತ್ತು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಹೆಡ್ ಕ್ವಾರ್ಟರುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಷಣಮಾಡುವಾಗ "ಪೋಲೀಸ್‌ನವರು ಬಹಳ ಅನ್ಯಾಯಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ, ದೇಶವನ್ನು ನಾಶ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ" ಎಂದು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಭಾಷಣಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದರು. ಆಗ ನಾನೂ ಕೂಡ ಎಷ್ಟೋಸಲ ಅವರ ಜೊತೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಓಡಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈಗ ನನಗೆ ತಿಳಿದಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಕೋಲಾರ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್‌ನವರ ಅನುಭವದ ಒಂದು ಮಾತು ಹೇಳಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾಲ್ಕರಷ್ಟು ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗುತ್ತಾ ಇದೆಯೋ ಏನೋ ಎಂದು ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆಗಿನ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಪೋಲೀಸ್‌ನವರು ಯಾರನ್ನಾದರೂ ಅರೆಸ್ಟುಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಮ್ಯಾಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಟರ ಅಥವಾ ಮ್ಯಾಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಟರ ಪರವಾನಗಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಅರೆಸ್ಟುಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದರು. ಈಗ ಅವರನ್ನು ಕೇಳುವುದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಏನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ವ್ಯಾನ್‌ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದು ಯಾರನ್ನು ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಹಿಡಿದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುತ್ತಾರೆ. 24 ಗಂಟೆಯೊಳಗೆ ಮ್ಯಾಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಟರ ಮುಂದೆ ಹಾಜರು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು ಕೂಡ ಇಲ್ಲ. 15 ದಿವಸ ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಪೋಲೀಸ್‌ನವರ ಕಸ್ಟಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ನಾನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ಗೌರೀಬಿದನೂರಿನ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಗೊತ್ತಿರಬಹುದು. ಇದನ್ನು ಸರಿಪಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಶಕ್ತಿ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ ಏನೋ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ವಿವರಗಳನ್ನು ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ನಾನು ಬಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ಎಷ್ಟೋಸಲ ಸುಮಾರು 50-60 ಜನ ದೂರು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದ್ದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಯಾವ ಕಾರ್ಯ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಚ್ ವೆಂಕಟರೆಡ್ಡಿ.)

ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನೂ ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಈ ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಅನ್ಯಾಯ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಾ ಇದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಏನೋ ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಕಾರಣ ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಪಾನನಿರೋಧದ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ—ಪೋಲೀಸ್‌ನವರು ಏನೂ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಅಲ್ಲ. ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಮಾಡಿದ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ, ಕೆಲವು ವೇಳೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ, ಅವರಿಗೆ support ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಇದ್ದರೆ support ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ಉದಾಹರಣೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. 1956ನೆಯ ಇಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಮಾರು 50-60 ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಗಾಂಜಾವನ್ನು ಒಂದು ದಿವಸ ಹಿಡಿದರು. ಆದರೆ ಆ ಕೇಸನ್ನು ಹೋಂ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರ್ ಅವರು withdraw ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಏಕೆ withdraw ಮಾಡಿದರು ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಯಾವಾಗ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಚ್. ವೆಂಕಟರೆಡ್ಡಿ.—1956ರಲ್ಲಿ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಯಾವ ತಿಂಗಳಿನಲ್ಲಿ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಎಚ್. ವೆಂಕಟರೆಡ್ಡಿ.—ಜೂನ್ ತಿಂಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಇರಬಹುದು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಹೊಸ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಆಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಚ್. ವೆಂಕಟರೆಡ್ಡಿ.—ಹೌದು ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಗೃಹಸಚಿವರ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. 107ನೆಯ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಇದೆ. ಆ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಎಂತಹವರಮೇಲೆ ಕೇಸು ಹಾಕಬೇಕು ಎಂದರೆ ರೌಡಿಗಳಾಗಿರಬೇಕು ಮತ್ತು ಎಷ್ಟೋಸಲ ಜೈಲಿಗೆಹೋಗಿ ಬಂದಿರಬೇಕು. ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪೋಲೀಸ್‌ಸ್ಟೇಷನ್ ನೋಡಿಲ್ಲ, ಜೈಲು ನೋಡಿಲ್ಲ, ಕೋರ್ಟು ನೋಡಿಲ್ಲ ಅಂತಹವರು ಒಬ್ಬರನ್ನು ಮೊನ್ನೆ ಚುನಾವಣೆಗೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಹಿಡಿದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಿ 107 ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಕೇಸು ಹಾಕಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ಒಂದು ಉದಾಹರಣೆ ಆದರೆ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಂತಹವು ಎಷ್ಟು ನಡೆಯುತ್ತವೆಯೋ ಏನೋ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಚಿಕ್ಕಬಳ್ಳಾಪುರ ಸಬ್‌ಡಿವಿಜನ್ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇಂತಹ ಕೇಸುಗಳು ಎಷ್ಟಿವೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ರೆಕಾರ್ಡ್ ತರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ನೋಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಕೆಲವು ದೊಡ್ಡ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಲೀಡರ್‌ಗಳಿಂದ ಇಂಟರ್ ಫಿಯರೆನ್ಸ್ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಾ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ನಮ್ಮ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವಿಚಾರ ಹೇಳಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ, ನಮ್ಮ ಕೋಲಾರ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸಪುರ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು, ಚಿಂತಾಮಣಿ, ಗೌರೀಬಿದನೂರು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಅಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಾ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಆಗುತ್ತಾ ಇರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣ ಈ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್‌ನವರು ಸೋತುಹೋಗಿದ್ದಕ್ಕೋ ಏನೋ ಎಂದು ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅದಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಕಾರಣ ಏನು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ವಿಚಾರಿಸದೆ ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಕಷ್ಟಕೊಡುತ್ತಾ ಇರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ, ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಶೋಚನೀಯ. ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದಾದರೂ ಇದನ್ನು ಸರಿಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೀರಿ ಎಂದು ನಂಬಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವಿಚಾರ: ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೊಗೆಸೊಪ್ಪನ್ನು ಕ್ಯೂರ್‌ಮಾಡುವ ಸೀಜನ್ನು. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಸೌದೆ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೊಗೆಸೊಪ್ಪನ್ನು ಕ್ಯೂರ್‌ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಟ್ಟಿಗೆಗಾಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ತಂದಾಗ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್‌ನವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟವರಾದರೆ ಅವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಒಂದು ಕೇಸೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಕ್ಷದ ವಿರೋಧಿಗಳವರದಾದರೆ, ಅಂಥವರನ್ನು ಹಿಡಿದು ತಳ್ಳು ಲಾಕಪ್‌ಗೆ ಹಾಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ತಳ್ಳಿ, ಪೋಲೀಸ್‌ನವರು ಅವರಮೇಲೆ ಕೇಸು ಹಾಕುತ್ತಾರೆ. ತಳ್ಳುವುದು, ಲಾಕಪ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಕುವುದು ಎಂದರೆ ಏನು ನ್ಯಾಯ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ?

Sri H. S. RUDRAPPA.—May I request the Hon'ble Member to give instances so that I may be able to investigate and take action.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಚ್. ವೆಂಕಟರೆಡ್ಡಿ.—ನಾಳೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಕೊನೆಯದಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಪೂಣಚ್ಚರವರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ ಅವರು ನಮ್ಮ ಹಳೆಯ ಮೈಸೂರಿನವರಲ್ಲ. ಆಚೆಕಡೆಯಿಂದ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಬಂದು ಸೇರಿರುವವರು. ನಮ್ಮೆಲ್ಲರಲ್ಲೂ, ನಾವು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಹಳೆಯ ಮೈಸೂರಿನವರಿಗಿಂತಲೂ ಆಚೆಯಿಂದ ಬಂದಿರುವವರು ಸತ್ಯವಂತರು ಎಂದು ಭಾವಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಕಾಪಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ಅತ್ಯಂತ ವಿನಯದಿಂದ ಕೇಳಿಕೊಂಡು ನನ್ನ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಮುಕ್ತಾಯಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri H. S. RUDRAPPA.—I strongly refute the sweeping remark that the old Mysoreans are not honest or that they are dishonest. That is not correct. He must withdraw those words.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಚ್. ವೆಂಕಟರೆಡ್ಡಿ.—ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರು ಅಸತ್ಯವಂತರು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ. ನನಗಿಂತ ಇನ್ನೊಬ್ಬರು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯವರು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ನಾನು ಕೆಟ್ಟವನು ಎಂದು ಅಲ್ಲವಲ್ಲಾ !

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಹಳೆಯ ಮೈಸೂರಿನವರು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯವರಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ತಾವು ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲವಷ್ಟೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಚ್. ವೆಂಕಟರೆಡ್ಡಿ.—ಇಲ್ಲ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಮ್ಮ ಭಾವನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇವರಿಗಿಂತ ಅವರು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯವರು, ಅಷ್ಟೆ (ನಗು !).

7 P.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—These Demands, namely, Demands Nos. 15, 16, and 17 will be taken up tomorrow. Along with these Demands, 13-Genearl Administration also will be taken up tomorrow. I think we will be able to finish these Demands within one hour and then we can take up 13-General Administration.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Along with what ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I request Hon'ble Members to hear fully what the Chair says and not jump at it without fully hearing it.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ನಮಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಕೇಳಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬುದು ತಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಪರ್ಯಾಲೋಚನೆಮಾಡಬೇಕು. I never

meant any reflection against anybody, much less against the Speaker. I did not jump at the Speaker. 'Jump at the Speaker' would mean that I am trying to catch every word of the Speaker to jump at the Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member need not take like that because there have been so many instances in which Members have tried to catch a word or two of the Speaker and jump at the Speaker, but I need not relate them here. I do not say that it is wrong, because if I utter a wrong word or something which I ought not to utter it is the duty of Hon'ble Members to point it out to me.

What I announced was that these Demands would be taken up tomorrow. After they are finished, '13-General Administration' also would be taken up. I think we would be able to finish '13-General Administration' tomorrow, as well.

The House will now adjourn and meet at 2 P.M. tomorrow.

The House adjourned at Five Minutes past Seven of the Clock to meet again at Two of the Clock on Wednesday, the 17th July 1957.